

SENATE.

MONDAY, April 19, 1909.

Prayer by Rev. Ulysses G. B. Pierce, of the city of Washington.

JAMES P. CLARKE, a Senator from the State of Arkansas, and BENJAMIN R. TILLMAN, a Senator from the State of South Carolina, appeared in their seats to-day.

The Journal of the proceedings of Thursday last was read and approved.

FINDINGS OF THE COURT OF CLAIMS.

The VICE-PRESIDENT laid before the Senate communications from the assistant clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting certified copies of the findings of fact filed by the court in the following causes:

In the cause of the Deacons of the Missionary Baptist Church, of Franklin, Tenn., *v. United States* (S. Doc. No. 12);

In the cause of the Trustees of the Mount Olivet Methodist Episcopal Church South, of Nolensville, Tenn., *v. United States* (S. Doc. No. 9);

In the cause of the Trustees of the Christian Church of Warsaw, Mo., *v. United States* (S. Doc. No. 8);

In the cause of the Trustees of Grace Episcopal Church, of Berryville, Va., *v. United States* (S. Doc. No. 11); and

In the cause of the Trustees of the Methodist Episcopal Church South of Fairfax Court House, Va., *v. United States* (S. Doc. No. 10).

The foregoing findings were, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Claims and ordered to be printed.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. W. J. Browning, its Chief Clerk, announced that the House had passed the bill (H. R. 1438) to provide revenue, equalize duties, and encourage the industries of the United States, and for other purposes, in which the concurrence of the Senate was requested.

HOUSE BILL REFERRED.

H. R. 1438. An act to provide revenue, equalize duties, and encourage the industries of the United States, and for other purposes, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Finance.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

The VICE-PRESIDENT presented a memorial of the general court of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, remonstrating against the imposition by the Federal Government of a tax on inheritances, which was ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented a memorial of the Cigarmakers' International Union of America, remonstrating against the importation of cigars free of duty from the Philippine Islands, which was ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented the memorial of P. Rielly & Son, of Newark, N. J., relative to the duty on green salted hides, which was ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented a petition of the New York Silk Conditioning Works, of New York City, N. Y., praying that the duties on all wools imported in the grease should be levied at given rates upon the actual conditioned scoured weight, which was ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented a memorial of the National Wool Growers' Association, relative to the duty on wools, which was ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented petitions of sundry citizens of New York, Ohio, Washington, Pennsylvania, Michigan, New Jersey, Georgia, Mississippi, Wisconsin, Texas, Massachusetts, Missouri, West Virginia, Maine, California, Nebraska, Virginia, Utah, Oklahoma, Kentucky, North Carolina, Arkansas, Illinois, Kansas, South Carolina, Minnesota, Louisiana, Colorado, and Indiana, praying for a reduction of the duty on raw and refined sugars, which were ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. FRYE presented petitions of sundry citizens of Maine, praying for a reduction of the duty on raw and refined sugars, which were ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented a petition of Typographical Union, No. 643, American Federation of Labor, of Waterville, Me., praying for a reduction of the duty on wood pulp and print paper, which was ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented a memorial of sundry citizens of Riley, Me., and a memorial of sundry citizens of Livermore, Me., remonstrating against the repeal of the duty on wood pulp and print paper, which were ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. CULLOM presented petitions of sundry citizens of Illinois, praying for a reduction of the duty on raw and refined sugars, which were ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented a memorial of sundry business firms of Chicago, Ill., remonstrating against an increase of the duty on millinery, which was ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. GALLINGER presented petitions of sundry citizens of New Hampshire, praying for a reduction of the duty on raw and refined sugars, which were ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented a memorial of the New Hampshire forestry commission, remonstrating against the repeal of the duty on print paper, wood pulp, and lumber, which was ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented a memorial of sundry citizens of Enfield, Lebanon, Plymouth, and Warren, all in the State of New Hampshire, remonstrating against the duty on hosiery and gloves, which was ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. PILES presented petitions of sundry citizens of Washington, praying for a reduction of the duty on raw and refined sugars, which were ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented a petition of the Lithographing Company of Spokane, Wash., praying for an increase of the duty on lithographic products, which was ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. I present a telegram, in the nature of a memorial, from the Battle Creek Industrial Association, of Michigan, relative to an income tax. I ask that the memorial be read for the information of the Senate, and that it be laid on the table.

There being no objection, the memorial was read and ordered to lie on the table, as follows:

[Telegram.]

BATTLE CREEK, MICH., April 17, 1909.

Senator WILLIAM ALDEN SMITH,
Washington, D. C.

The business men who were strong enough to hold the Republican national convention to an indorsement of the courts will insist that if any income tax be established it will apply to all incomes, whether from wages, salaries, business profits, rents, or interests. No one class shall be taxed to support another. Every man must bear his share of tax if he enjoys a share of government protection.

BATTLE CREEK INDUSTRIAL ASSOCIATION.

Mr. SCOTT presented petitions of sundry citizens of the United States, praying that an appropriation be made for a memorial to James Rumsey, to be placed in Statuary Hall, which were referred to the Committee on the Library.

He also presented a memorial of sundry citizens of Follansbee, W. Va., remonstrating against the drawback feature, pertaining to tin plates, in the so-called "Payne tariff bill," which was ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented a petition of Typographical Union No. 79, Allied Printing Trades, of Wheeling, W. Va., praying for a reduction of the duty on paper and wood pulp, which was ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented petitions of sundry citizens of Clarksburg, Hunton, Parkersburg, Farmington, Monongah, Willowton, and Oakville, all in the State of West Virginia, praying for a reduction of the duty on raw and refined sugars, which were ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. CUMMINS presented a memorial of sundry citizens of Iowa, remonstrating against the proposed increase of the duty on imported gloves, which was ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. WARNER presented petitions of sundry citizens of Missouri, praying for a reduction of the duty on raw and refined sugars, which were ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented a memorial of Typographical Union No. 80, American Federation of Labor, of Kansas City, Mo., remonstrating against an increase of the duty on print paper and wood pulp, which was ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented a petition of sundry citizens of Novinger, Mo., praying for a direct duty on crude oil of not less than the present countervailing duty, which was ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. BURNHAM presented a memorial of the New Hampshire Forestry Association, of Concord, N. H., remonstrating against the repeal of the duty on print paper, wood pulp, and lumber, which was ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented petitions of sundry citizens of New London, Portsmouth, Stratham, Rye, Wolfeboro, and Berlin, all in the State of New Hampshire, praying for a reduction of the duty on raw and refined sugars, which were ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. BRADLEY presented petitions of sundry citizens of South Carrollton, Glasgow, Moorefield, Moorehead, Roseville, Williamsburg, Ashton, and Corydon, all in the State of Kentucky, praying for a reduction of the duty on raw and refined sugars, which were ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. JONES presented petitions of sundry citizens of Washington, praying for a reduction of the duty on raw and refined sugars, which were ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented petitions of sundry lumber and shingle manufacturers of Washington, praying that the duty on shingles

be increased to 50 cents per thousand, which were ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. OLIVER presented petitions of sundry citizens of Pennsylvania, praying for a reduction of the duty on raw and refined sugars, which were ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. FRAZIER presented petitions of sundry citizens of Tennessee, praying for a reduction of the duty on raw and refined sugars, which were ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented petitions of sundry citizens of Tennessee, praying for a protective duty on hosiery, which were ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented memorials of sundry citizens of Tennessee, remonstrating against an increase of the duty on hosiery and gloves, which were ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. LODGE. I present a concurrent resolution of the legislature of Massachusetts, relative to a tax on inheritances. I ask that it be read and referred to the Committee on Finance.

There being no objection, the concurrent resolution was read and referred to the Committee on Finance, as follows:

THE COMMONWEALTH OF MASSACHUSETTS.

Resolutions protesting against the imposition by the Federal Government of a tax on inheritances.

Resolved, That the general court of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, believing that inheritances should not be made a subject for national taxation, but should be left to the respective States as a source of revenue, especially in times of peace, respectfully protests against the imposition by the Federal Government of a tax on inheritances.

Resolved, That certified copies of these resolutions be sent by the secretary of the Commonwealth to the presiding officers of both branches of Congress, and to each of the Senators and Representatives from Massachusetts.

In house of representatives, adopted April 5, 1909.

In senate, adopted in concurrence April 7, 1909.

A true copy.

Attest:

WILLIAM M. OLIN.

Secretary of the Commonwealth.

Mr. LODGE presented a concurrent resolution of the legislature of Massachusetts, which was referred to the Committee on Pensions, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE COMMONWEALTH OF MASSACHUSETTS.

Resolution relative to rolls of Revolutionary regiments and companies and to statements regarding Revolutionary pensioners.

Whereas the last soldier of the Revolution passed away years ago, and pensions based upon services of ancestors in the Revolution have almost ceased to exist, and further protection to the interests of the National Government by withholding from the people the details of Revolutionary pension cases or rolls of Revolutionary regiments and companies now in possession of the United States is unnecessary; and

Whereas Massachusetts furnished a large percentage of the soldiers of the Revolution, and the detailed facts of their service contained in said statements and rolls are of historic and genealogical value to the State and to their descendants living in Massachusetts, as well as to the large number of such descendants living in other States: Therefore be it

Resolved, That our Senators and Representatives in Congress are recommended to take early concerted action to bring about public access to the Revolutionary rolls and all documents pertaining to applications for Revolutionary pensions now in the possession of the United States, with the right to copy them in whole or in part under such conditions and regulations as may be necessary for their safety and preservation; and that a copy of this resolution be forwarded to each of the Senators and Representatives in Congress from this Commonwealth.

Adopted. Sent up for concurrence.

JAMES W. KIMBALL, Clerk.

Adopted in concurrence.

HENRY D. COOLIDGE, Clerk.

A true copy.

Attest:

JAMES W. KIMBALL,
Clerk House of Representatives.

Mr. LODGE presented petitions of sundry citizens of Boston, Lowell, and North Westport, all in the State of Massachusetts, praying for the repeal of the duty on tea, which were ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented petitions of sundry citizens of Clinton, Kingston, Chicopee, Fall River, South Orleans, Hingham, Framingham, Cambridge, New Bedford, Cohasset, and Somerville, all in the State of Massachusetts, praying for a reduction of the duty on raw and refined sugars, which were ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. BURKETT presented a petition of the Western Fruit Jobbers' Association, of Omaha, Nebr., remonstrating against a reduction of the duty on citrus fruits, pineapples, raisins, etc., which was ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. SIMMONS presented petitions of sundry citizens of North Carolina, praying for a reduction of the duty on raw and refined sugars, which were ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. NEWLANDS presented a petition of the National Board of Trade, praying for the enactment of legislation providing for the preservation and conservation of the forests of the country, which was referred to the Committee on the Conservation of National Resources.

Mr. BRISTOW presented petitions of sundry citizens of Kansas, praying for a reduction of the duty on raw and refined sugars, which were ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. BURTON presented petitions of sundry citizens of Ohio, praying for a reduction of the duty on raw and refined sugars, which were ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. CLAPP presented petitions of sundry citizens of Minnesota, praying for a reduction of the duty on raw and refined sugars, which were ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. DU PONT presented petitions of sundry citizens of Delaware, praying for a reduction of the duty on raw and refined sugars, which were ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. DEPEW presented petitions of sundry citizens of New York, praying for a reduction of the duty on raw and refined sugars, which were ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented a memorial of the board of supervisors of Washington County, N. Y., remonstrating against a reduction of the duty on wood pulp and print paper, which was ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented a memorial of the Chamber of Commerce of Buffalo, N. Y., remonstrating against an increase of the duty on barley not to exceed 10 per cent ad valorem, which was ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented a petition of Huron Grange, No. 124, Patrons of Husbandry, of Wolcott, N. Y., praying for the repeal of the proposed duty on sugar, which was ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented a petition of sundry employees of Balch, Price & Co., of Brooklyn, N. Y., praying for the adoption of an equitable tariff schedule relating to furs, which was ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented a petition of Local Grange No. 348, Patrons of Husbandry, of Wolcott, N. Y., praying for the passage of the so-called "rural parcels-post bill," which was referred to the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads.

He also presented a petition of the Board of Trade of Johnstown, N. Y., praying for the retention of the proposed tariff schedule relating to gloves, which was ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented a petition of the Live Stock Association of East Buffalo, N. Y., praying for a reduction of the duty on live stock, which was ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented a petition of sundry growers of hops, of Kobleskill, N. Y., praying for the imposition of a duty on imported hops, which was ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented a petition of Typographical Union No. 15, American Federation of Labor, of Rochester, N. Y., praying for a reduction of the duty on print paper and wood pulp, which was ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. PERKINS presented petitions of sundry citizens of California, praying for a reduction of the duty on raw and refined sugars, which were ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented a petition of the Chamber of Mines of Los Angeles, Cal., praying for a protective duty on petroleum, which was ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented a petition of the Chamber of Commerce of Los Angeles, Cal., praying for an increase of the duty on asphalt, which was ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented petitions of sundry citizens of Sonoma, Santa Clara, and San Bernardino counties, all in the State of California, praying for the repeal of the duty on sulphate and muriate potashes, which were ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented a petition of the Asiatic Exclusion League, of San Francisco, Cal., praying for the enactment of legislation to prohibit the immigration into the United States of all Asiatics, except merchants, students, and travelers, which was referred to the Committee on Immigration.

Mr. ROOT presented petitions of sundry citizens of New York, praying for a protective duty on post cards, which were ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented a petition of sundry citizens of Kobleskill, N. Y., praying for a duty of not less than 20 cents per pound on all hops imported from foreign countries, which was ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented a petition of the Live Stock Association, of East Buffalo, N. Y., praying for a reduction of the duty on live stock, which was ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented a memorial of the Yellow Pine Exchange, of New York City, N. Y., remonstrating against a reduction of the duty on lumber, which was ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented a petition of Typographical Union No. 55, American Federation of Labor, of Syracuse, N. Y., praying for the retention of the proposed duty on print paper and wood pulp, which was ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented a petition of sundry citizens of Port Leyden, N. Y., praying for the retention of the proposed duty on hosiery, which was ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented a memorial of sundry citizens of Buffalo, N. Y., remonstrating against an increase of the duty on cotton goods, which was ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented a memorial of sundry citizens of New York, remonstrating against the repeal of the duty on millinery, which was ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. GUGGENHEIM presented a petition of the Chamber of Commerce of Denver, Colo., praying for the ratification of reciprocal trade relations with the Dominion of Canada, which was ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented a petition of sundry citizens of Colorado Springs, Colo., and a petition of the E. C. Kropp Company, of Milwaukee, Wis., praying for an increase of the duty on post cards, which were ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented petitions of sundry citizens of Colorado, praying that tea and coffee be placed on the free list, which were ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented a petition of the Henkel-Duke Mercantile Company of Pueblo, Colo., praying for the repeal of the duty on raw and refined sugars, which was ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented a memorial of the board of county commissioners of Lincoln County, Colo., remonstrating against the repeal of the duty on wool, woolen goods, and hides, which was ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented a petition of Left Hand Grange, No. 9, Patrons of Husbandry, of Niwot, Colo., praying for the appointment of a nonpartisan tariff commission, which was ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented a memorial of sundry lead ore producers of Idaho, Utah, Colorado, and Nevada, remonstrating against a reduction of the duty on lead ore, pig lead, bars, and base bullion, which was ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented memorials of sundry citizens of Maricopa County, Ariz., remonstrating against a reduction of the duty on sugar imported from the Philippine Islands, which were ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. NELSON presented an affidavit to accompany the bill (S. 629) granting an increase of pension to Laura M. Hoard, which was referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE presented petitions of sundry citizens of Wisconsin, praying for a reduction of the duty on raw and refined sugars, which were ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. RAYNER presented petitions of sundry citizens of Maryland, praying for a reduction of the duty on raw and refined sugars, which were ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. DANIEL. I present the petitions of C. B. Camper, of Fincastle; The J. W. Rowe Company (Incorporated) of Hampton; C. J. Hedride, of Fincastle; R. K. Thompson, of Fincastle; M. A. Woodson, of Fincastle; W. N. Breckinridge, of Fincastle; F. D. Bolton, of Fincastle; Frank B. Perry, of Orange; R. H. Rawlings, of Orange; J. R. Grymes, of Orange; H. P. Jones, of Orange; L. Willis, jr., of Orange; Robert W. Sparks, of Orange; P. M. Watts, of Orange; R. C. Slaughter, of Orange; T. N. Sparks, of Orange; J. E. Long, of Orange; Kelly & Borum, of Norfolk; George W. Daughtry, of Norfolk; Spindle & Co., of Norfolk; Samuel A. Grimsley, of Culpeper; S. M. Newhouse, of Culpeper; T. E. Grimsley, of Culpeper; Thomas Wampler, of Culpeper; R. P. Rixey, of Culpeper; J. T. Wampler, of Culpeper; J. B. Stringfellow, of Culpeper; J. James Roberts, of Culpeper; H. C. Burrows, of Culpeper; S. D. Moore, of Charlotte Court House; V. V. Paugh, of Charlotte Court House; J. W. Hamlett, of Rough Creek; W. M. Roberts, of Rough Creek; W. M. Peak, of Rough Creek; W. T. Spencer & Son, of Fort Mitchell; M. D. Parrish, of Fort Mitchell; J. T. Newcombe, of Fort Mitchell; H. G. Fore, of Fort Mitchell; G. E. Thompson, of Fort Mitchell; R. C. Williams, of Fort Mitchell; E. F. Thomason, of Clarendon; J. E. L. Hughes, of Penn Laird; B. T. Suter, of Penn Laird; P. K. Bauman, of Lloyds; P. S. Hart, of Penola; M. L. Hargrove, of Penola; R. L. Lovey, of Penola; E. M. Coleman, of Penola; R. S. Hargrove, of Penola; Augustus J. Smith, of Manchester; B. O. Nunnally, of Manchester; W. C. Flinn, of Manchester; B. A. Nunnally, of Manchester; H. C. Beattie, of Manchester; Charles Stein, of Manchester; Eddie L. Kidd, of Manchester; M. A. Campbell, of Manchester; E. Slump, of Manchester; Lynchburg Steam Bakery, of Lynchburg; W. T. Blankinship, of Lynchburg; T. E. Griffith, of Lynchburg; E. P. Marable, of Lynchburg; A. B. Chewning, of Lynchburg; R. T. Capps, of Norfolk; W. B. Cochran, of Norfolk; A. D. Doney, of Norfolk; A. Hueffner, of Norfolk; E. J. Turner, of Galts Mills; S. J. Bailey, of Galts Mills; R. E. Faulkner, of Nasons; Lockett Jenkins Company, of Crewe; W. H. Haney, of Claremont; Davis & Atkins, of Richmond; John B. Winfree, jr., of Lynch-

burg; and of Whitehead & Yeatts, of Chatham, all in the State of Virginia; and of J. A. Edmondson & Son, of Baltimore, Md., praying for a reduction of the duty on raw and refined sugars.

I ask that one, as a sample, may be printed in the Record.

The petitions were ordered to lie on the table, and the petition ordered to be printed in the Record is as follows:

To the United States Senate, Washington, D. C.:

The undersigned respectfully ask for a reduction in the duty on raw and refined sugars, in the interest both of the 80,000,000 consumers of the country and the manufacturing industries in which it is an important material. This tax amounts to 2 cents per pound on refined sugar, equivalent to an 80 per cent ad valorem duty.

This exorbitant tax is not justified by the conditions relating to the production or refining of sugar in this country. Leading sugar refiners have testified that they need no tariff protection against foreign refiners, and there is no good reason why all the people should be heavily taxed in the interest of one industry.

The relatively high price of sugar operates to prevent its more general use in the manufacture of preserved fruits of all kinds, and by adding to the cost of these articles limits their consumption. While this is the greatest fruit-growing country in the world, our exports of jams, jellies, etc., are comparatively small, as we can not compete in neutral markets with countries like Great Britain, which have the advantage of cheap sugar. A reduction of the sugar tax would greatly increase domestic consumption of these articles and would give us a much larger share of the export trade. In many cases the canners would be enabled to buy and preserve fruits that are now wasted for lack of a market.

We believe that this is a matter which should be decided by Congress in favor of the policy which will benefit the greater number of the people, and that the interests of the consumers should receive the consideration to which they are entitled. The tax on sugar is paid wholly by the consumers and is an unnecessary burden on one of the principal articles of their food. A reduction in this tax would therefore be an unquestioned advantage to the people of the entire country.

C. B. CAMPER, Fincastle, Va.

APRIL 9, 1909.

REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE.

Mr. WARREN, from the Committee on Military Affairs, to whom was referred the bill (S. 1660) for the relief of Samuel Liverpool, asked to be discharged from its further consideration, and that it be referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs, which was agreed to.

He also, from the same committee, to whom were referred the following bills, asked to be discharged from their further consideration and that they be referred to the Committee on Claims, which was agreed to:

- A bill (S. 1651) for the relief of William Hayes;
- A bill (S. 1654) for the relief of Eric E. Walgen;
- A bill (S. 1667) for the relief of Kate Rilling;
- A bill (S. 1671) for the relief of Annie Catherine Mettier;
- A bill (S. 1672) for the relief of John Birkett; and
- A bill (S. 1673) for the relief of Charles Goody, his heirs or assigns.

BILLS INTRODUCED.

Bills and a joint resolution were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. FRYE:

A bill (S. 1821) granting an increase of pension to Charles E. Peabody; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. CULLOM:

A bill (S. 1822) granting a pension to Martha A. Cheyne (with the accompanying papers); and

A bill (S. 1823) granting a pension to Harriett Scott (with the accompanying paper); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. McLAURIN:

A bill (S. 1824) for the relief of the heirs of J. H. Peeples;

A bill (S. 1825) for the relief of Emily Donnelly, widow of James M. Donnelly, deceased;

A bill (S. 1826) for the relief of the estate of Ellen Elizabeth Samuel, deceased (with the accompanying paper); and

A bill (S. 1827) for the relief of the heirs of John Linton, deceased; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. OVERMAN:

A bill (S. 1828) for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building thereon at Rockingham, N. C.; and

A bill (S. 1829) for the erection of a public building at Burlington, N. C.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

A bill (S. 1830) for the relief of the estate of Stephen Johnson, deceased; to the Committee on Claims.

A bill (S. 1831) granting a pension to Zennie Stanton;

A bill (S. 1832) granting an increase of pension to Alfred Rector;

A bill (S. 1833) granting an increase of pension to John D. Capps;

A bill (S. 1834) granting an increase of pension to William Hess, alias William Smith;

A bill (S. 1835) granting an increase of pension to James J. Ballinger;

A bill (S. 1836) granting a pension to Caroline Beachboard;
 A bill (S. 1837) granting an increase of pension to Stephen M. Buckner;
 A bill (S. 1838) granting a pension to Wiley S. Roberts;
 A bill (S. 1839) granting an increase of pension to Elijah P. Hensley;
 A bill (S. 1840) granting an increase of pension to H. J. Edge;
 A bill (S. 1841) granting an increase of pension to Smith F. Carroll;
 A bill (S. 1842) granting an increase of pension to James B. Sprinkle;
 A bill (S. 1843) granting a pension to Elza Lawrence;
 A bill (S. 1844) granting an increase of pension to Sophronia Roberts;
 A bill (S. 1845) granting a pension to Seymour B. Wacaster;
 A bill (S. 1846) granting an increase of pension to J. C. Albritton;
 A bill (S. 1847) granting an increase of pension to Wilson Carter;
 A bill (S. 1848) granting an increase of pension to John Smith;
 A bill (S. 1849) granting an increase of pension to William L. Creasman;
 A bill (S. 1850) granting an increase of pension to Chisley G. Hagan;
 A bill (S. 1851) granting a pension to Daniel Skipper;
 A bill (S. 1852) granting a pension to James Carroll;
 A bill (S. 1853) granting an increase of pension to P. C. Monteiro;
 A bill (S. 1854) granting an increase of pension to Edwin Stephens;
 A bill (S. 1855) granting a pension to Timothy Edwards;
 A bill (S. 1856) granting an increase of pension to Jane Henderson;
 A bill (S. 1857) granting a pension to Joseph B. Voris;
 A bill (S. 1858) granting an increase of pension to Wiley S. Roberts;
 A bill (S. 1859) granting an increase of pension to Franklin B. Carland; and
 A bill (S. 1860) granting an increase of pension to Henry A. White; to the Committee on Pensions.
 By Mr. JOHNSTON of Alabama:
 A bill (S. 1861) for the relief of the heirs of Gen. John A. Quitman; to the Committee on Claims.
 By Mr. JOHNSON of North Dakota:
 A bill (S. 1862) to prohibit selling of intoxicating beverages in Territory of Hawaii; to the Committee on Pacific Islands and Porto Rico.
 By Mr. BRADLEY:
 A bill (S. 1863) granting an increase of pension to Robert H. Clark; to the Committee on Pensions.
 By Mr. GALLINGER:
 A bill (S. 1864) to facilitate the use for manufacturing purposes of square No. 328 in the city of Washington, as authorized in the act of Congress of February 1, 1907 (with the accompanying paper); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.
 By Mr. NEWLANDS:
 A bill (S. 1865) granting a pension to Margaret Mackey; to the Committee on Pensions.
 By Mr. WARREN:
 A bill (S. 1866) providing that the State of Wyoming be permitted to relinquish to the United States certain lands heretofore selected and to select other lands from the public domain in lieu thereof; to the Committee on Public Lands.
 By Mr. DICK:
 A bill (S. 1867) for the relief of John C. Scantling, lieutenant-colonel, United States Army, retired; to the Committee on Military Affairs.
 A bill (S. 1868) for the relief of Elizabeth F. Irvin; to the Committee on Claims.
 A bill (S. 1869) granting a pension to Dana A. Smalley; to the Committee on Pensions.
 By Mr. BURKEIT:
 A bill (S. 1870) authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to convey to Frank H. Young not to exceed 5 acres of land within the Santee Indian Reservation in Nebraska; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.
 By Mr. GUGGENHEIM:
 A bill (S. 1871) for a public building for the United States Geological Survey at Washington, D. C.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.
 A bill (S. 1872) setting apart a tract of land to be used as a cemetery by the Independent Order of Odd Fellows of Central City, Colo.;

A bill (S. 1873) providing for free homesteads in the Ute Indian Reservation in Colorado;
 A bill (S. 1874) allowing homesteaders on the Gunnison Tunnel project to leave their claims until water is available;
 A bill (S. 1875) to provide for the granting and patenting to the State of Colorado of certain desert lands within the former Ute Indian Reservation in said State;
 A bill (S. 1876) to aid the State of Colorado to support a school of mines; and
 A bill (S. 1877) to grant certain lands in the town of Fruita, Colo.; to the Committee on Public Lands.
 A bill (S. 1878) to reimburse the several States and Territories for expenses incurred in assisting the Government of the United States in raising, paying, organizing, supplying, and equipping troops for service in the war with Spain; and
 A bill (S. 1879) for the relief of Pete Jelovac; to the Committee on Claims.
 A bill (S. 1880) for the relief of Andrew B. Baird and James S. Baird, and to confirm all sales and dispositions heretofore made by the United States out of the confiscated land of the late Spruce M. Baird, their father, known as "Baird's ranch," in the Territory of New Mexico; to the Committee on Private Land Claims.
 By Mr. CLARK of Wyoming:
 A bill (S. 1881) granting an increase of pension to John Welch; to the Committee on Pensions.
 By Mr. BULKELEY (by request):
 A bill (S. 1882) for the relief of the estate of Antonia Sousa, deceased (with the accompanying paper); and
 A bill (S. 1883) granting an increase of pension to Thomas S. Gilbert (with the accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.
 By Mr. CUMMINS:
 A bill (S. 1884) to extend the free transmission through the mails of official mail matter of the organized militia of the several States; to the Committee on Military Affairs.
 By Mr. HALE:
 A bill (S. 1885) granting an increase of pension to Wilson M. Mayo; to the Committee on Pensions.
 By Mr. NELSON:
 A bill (S. 1886) granting an increase of pension to Martin J. Easland; and
 A bill (S. 1887) granting an increase of pension to Charles Heathfield; to the Committee on Pensions.
 By Mr. GUGGENHEIM:
 A joint resolution (S. J. R. 22) authorizing and directing the Secretary of War to dispose of certain obsolete guns; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

AMENDMENTS TO TARIFF BILL.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. I submit an amendment to be offered to the tariff bill.
 The proposed amendment was referred to the Committee on Finance and ordered to be printed.
 Mr. PAYNTER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H. R. 1438) to provide revenue, equalize duties, and encourage the industries of the United States, and for other purposes, which was ordered to lie on the table and be printed in the RECORD, as follows:
 Amendment intended to be proposed by Mr. PAYNTER to the bill (H. R. 1438) to provide revenue, equalize duties, and encourage the industries of the United States, and for other purposes.
 That subdivision 9 of section 3244 of the United States Revised Statutes, as amended by section 69 of the act entitled "An act to reduce taxation, to provide revenue for the Government, and for other purposes," approved August 28, 1894, is hereby further amended so as to read as follows:
 "Every person whose business it is to manufacture tobacco or snuff for himself, or who employs others to manufacture tobacco or snuff, whether such manufacture be by cutting, pressing, grinding, crushing, or rubbing of any raw or leaf tobacco, or otherwise preparing raw or leaf tobacco, or manufactured or partially manufactured tobacco or snuff, or the putting up for use or consumption of scraps, waste, clippings, stems, or deposits of tobacco resulting from any process of handling tobacco, or by the working or preparation of leaf tobacco, tobacco stems, scraps, clippings, or waste, by sifting, twisting, screening, or any other process, shall be regarded as a manufacturer of tobacco: *Provided*, That unstemmed tobacco in the natural leaf and not manufactured or altered in any manner shall not be subject to any internal-revenue tax or charge of any kind whatsoever, and it shall be lawful for any person to buy and sell such unstemmed tobacco in the leaf without payment of tax of any kind: *Provided further*, That any person who sells natural leaf tobacco to manufacturers of tobacco, snuff, or cigars shall be deemed and considered a dealer in leaf tobacco and become subject to all the provisions, rules, and regulations of subsection 6 of section 3244, United States Revised Statutes, as amended by section 14, act of March 1, 1879, and also as amended by the act of March 3, 1883, and further, shall be subject to all the provisions of section 3360, United States Revised Statutes, as amended by section 14, act of March 1, 1879, and of sections 3359 and 3391, United States Revised Statutes: *And provided further*, That farmers and growers of tobacco may sell leaf tobacco of their own growth and

raising to manufacturers of tobacco, snuff, or cigars without being considered leaf dealers or manufacturers of tobacco and shall not be subject to the sections of the law and amendments thereof above named."

Mr. OVERMAN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H. R. 1438) to provide revenue, equalize duties, and encourage the industries of the United States, and for other purposes, which was ordered to lie on the table and be printed.

Mr. BRADLEY submitted four amendments intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H. R. 1438) to provide revenue, equalize duties, and encourage the industries of the United States, and for other purposes, which were ordered to lie on the table and be printed.

Mr. DICK submitted two amendments intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H. R. 1438) to provide revenue, equalize duties, and encourage the industries of the United States, and for other purposes, which were ordered to lie on the table and be printed.

Mr. BURKETT submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H. R. 1438) to provide revenue, equalize duties, and encourage the industries of the United States, and for other purposes, which was ordered to lie on the table and be printed.

Mr. McCUMBER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H. R. 1438) to provide revenue, equalize duties, and encourage the industries of the United States, and for other purposes, which was ordered to lie on the table and be printed.

Mr. BULKELEY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H. R. 1438) to provide revenue, equalize duties, and encourage the industries of the United States, and for other purposes, which was ordered to lie on the table and be printed.

MRS. MARTHA E. WEST.

On motion of Mr. CLAPP, it was

Ordered, That the papers and files in case of Mrs. Martha E. West (No. 125, 58th Cong., 1st sess.) heretofore withdrawn by permission may be again filed with the Secretary of the Senate.

WITHDRAWAL OF PAPERS—GEORGE F. STEFFENS.

On motion of Mr. CLAPP, it was

Ordered, That leave be granted to withdraw from the files of the Senate the papers in the case of George F. Steffens (S. bill 1913, 60th Cong., 2d sess.), there having been no adverse report thereon.

EMMA W. ADAMS.

Mr. PENROSE submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 33), which was referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate:

Senate resolution 33.

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay to Emma W. Adams, widow of Milo R. Adams, late a messenger of the United States Senate, a sum equal to six months' salary at the rate he was receiving by law at the time of his demise, said sum to be considered as including funeral expenses and all other allowances.

THE CENSUS.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE submitted the following report:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 1033) to provide for the Thirteenth and subsequent decennial censuses, having met, after full and free conference have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 14, 15, 16, 21, 36, 37, and 38.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 18, 19, 20, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33, 34, and 35; and agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 1, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed, insert the following: "These employees shall be appointed by the Director of the Census upon such examination as he shall prescribe;" and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 13, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: Strike out the matter proposed to be inserted by said amendment; and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 17, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed insert the following: "That when the exigencies of the service require, the director may appoint for temporary employment from the aforesaid list of eligibles those who, by reason of residence or other conditions, are immediately available; and may also

appoint persons having had previous experience in operating mechanical appliances in census work whose efficiency records in operating such appliances are satisfactory to him, and may accept such records in lieu of the civil-service examination;" and the Senate agree to the same.

ROBERT M. LA FOLLETTE,
EUGENE HALE,
J. W. BAILEY,

Managers on the part of the Senate.

EDGAR D. CRUMPACKER,
EDWIN C. BURLEIGH,
JAMES HAY,

Managers on the part of the House.

Mr. McCUMBER. Mr. President, I would ask the Senator from Wisconsin if he will not consent to let the report go over until to-morrow?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, it is very desirable to get the bill through as soon as possible. The House is in session to-day and will not be in session again, as I am informed, until Thursday. If the report could be disposed of this morning and reach the House to-day, it might be disposed of there by unanimous consent. I hope there will be no objection to the adoption of the conference report to-day.

Mr. McCUMBER. I will say to the Senator that I do not expect to urge any particular objections to the conference report; but I do want to ask some questions that will necessarily need some explanation. It has been well known that the Senator from Rhode Island would to-day discuss—

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. If I may interrupt the Senator from North Dakota, I have just learned that the House has adjourned for the day, and if the Senate is to have a session to-morrow, and I suppose it is, I see no objection to the report going over.

Mr. McCUMBER. I thank the Senator from Wisconsin.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Without objection, the report goes over until to-morrow. No objection is heard.

DUTIES ON SUGAR IN FOREIGN COUNTRIES.

The VICE-PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States (S. Doc. No. 7), which was read, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Finance and ordered to be printed:

To the Senate:

I transmit a report by the Secretary of State, with an accompanying statement, made in response to the resolution of the Senate of April 8, 1909, requesting information as to "the amount of duties and taxes per 100 pounds which are levied and collected on sugar in the following countries: Great Britain, Germany, France, Russia, Austria-Hungary, the Netherlands, Belgium, Spain, Italy, and Denmark; also, which of these countries grant tariff concessions on imports of sugar from their colonies."

WM. H. TAFT.

THE WHITE HOUSE, April 19, 1909.

THE TARIFF.

Mr. ALDRICH. I ask unanimous consent that House bill 1438 be now laid before the Senate for consideration.

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 1438) to provide revenue, equalize duties, and encourage the industries of the United States, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on Finance with amendments.

Mr. ALDRICH. Mr. President, it is my purpose at the earliest possible moment to ask the Senate to consider the bill by paragraphs for amendment. I do not mean by this announcement that I shall try to stop what elsewhere is called "general debate" upon this subject. So far as the majority of the committee are concerned, and so far as I know, speaking for the friends of this measure, there will be no general discussion of the question of the wisdom or unwisdom of the protective policy. It is well understood, I assume, that the bill has been prepared along the declared lines of that policy. There will be no attempt, however, to restrict debate upon the other side of the Chamber. There will be no attempt by me or by any other member of the majority of the committee to explain in a lengthy speech the principles upon which the bill was constructed or the various provisions of its paragraphs. As these are reached in order the committee will be prepared to explain and defend their provisions.

Perhaps I should allude to a misapprehension which exists with reference to three items of the bill that were reported by the committee practically without recommendation. One is as to the provisions of the House bill on coal, putting it on the free

list, with reciprocal provisions; the other is in regard to news print paper and wood pulp; and the third is in regard to hides. It is not the purpose of the committee—and when I use the word "committee," I shall always mean the majority of the committee—to try to evade responsibility with reference to these items. As soon as the requisite data can be secured by the committee, they will report amendments which they will recommend to the Senate upon each of these three items.

Mr. President, I had intended to leave the question of estimating the amount of revenue to be derived from the pending bill until the consideration of the paragraphs had been completed in the Senate, but the character of the amendments which have been offered to the measure has led me to conclude that an earlier statement in this connection is desirable.

The practical question to which I shall ask your attention today is, Will the bill as reported from the Committee on Finance produce sufficient revenue when taken in connection with the internal-revenue taxes and other existing sources of revenue to meet the expenses of the Government without the imposition of additional taxes? I answer unhesitatingly, after a thorough and careful investigation of the facts and the conditions likely to surround the problem, that it will. I submit statements showing the receipts and disbursements, actual and estimated, of the Treasury for the fiscal years 1900 to 1911, inclusive.

Actual receipts and disbursements exclusive of Panama Canal for fiscal years 1900 to 1908, inclusive.

Fiscal year.	Receipts.	Disbursements.	Surplus.
1900.....	\$567,240,851.89	\$487,713,791.71	\$79,527,060.18
1901.....	587,685,337.53	509,967,353.15	77,717,984.38
1902.....	562,478,233.21	471,190,857.64	91,287,375.57
1903.....	590,396,674.40	508,089,022.04	82,307,652.35
1904.....	540,631,749.40	532,237,821.31	8,393,928.09
1905.....	544,274,684.85	563,390,093.62	19,085,408.77
1906.....	594,454,121.67	549,405,425.35	45,048,696.32
1907.....	663,140,334.05	551,705,129.04	111,435,205.01
1908.....	601,126,118.53	621,102,390.64	19,976,272.11

a Deficit.

Estimated receipts and disbursements for fiscal years 1909 to 1911, inclusive.

Fiscal year.	Receipts.	Disbursements.	Surplus.
1909.....	\$605,047,230.00	\$674,509,680.00	a \$69,462,450.00
1910.....	655,000,000.00	700,000,000.00	a 45,000,000.00
1911.....	695,000,000.00	665,000,000.00	30,000,000.00

a Deficit.

Actual receipts, nine and one-half months, 1909..... \$468,042,873.28
Disbursements, nine and one-half months, 1909..... 533,986,815.88
Deficit, nine and one-half months, 1909..... 65,943,942.60

In these statements both the receipts and disbursements for the Panama Canal have been eliminated for obvious reasons. It is the policy of Congress, which I think has universal approval, that payments for the canal and its construction should not be made from current revenues, but met by the sale of bonds.

In the official statement of receipts and expenditures heretofore made by the Treasury, the proceeds of the sale of canal bonds have not been included in the receipts, while the disbursements for the purchase and construction of the canal have been included in the table of expenditures.

The figures I submit are all for the fiscal years ending on the 30th of June, and they include all receipts and disbursements except those of the Post-Office Department and the Panama Canal, but the postal deficiencies are included in all cases in the disbursements. The statement consists of the actual official figures of receipts and disbursements for the years 1900 to 1908, inclusive, and show that in these years the act of 1897 (existing law) produced a surplus of \$428,656,221, an average yearly surplus of \$47,628,469. The statement commences with the year 1900. The Spanish war followed the enactment of the act of 1897, and the revenues and expenses of the Government did not reach normal conditions until the year 1900.

From data which I will submit, secured in consultation with Treasury experts, I have made up the figures, partly estimated and partly actual, showing the probable receipts and disbursements for the fiscal years 1909, 1910, and 1911.

Estimates of the amount of future receipts and disbursements of the Government must, in the nature of things, have an element of uncertainty; but the trained men who have been watching for years the course of the income and expenditures of the Government can form a very close estimate of the probable results.

Taking the present fiscal year for examination, first, we have the actual figures for nine and one-half months, which are: Receipts, \$468,042,873; disbursements, \$533,986,815; showing a deficit of \$65,943,942. I have taken the disbursements of \$533,986,815 for nine and one-half months and estimated those for the succeeding two and one-half months on the same basis, reaching the result of \$674,509,680 that I have indicated.

A considerable portion of the customs receipts for the remaining two and one-half months of the year 1909 will probably be collected under the terms of existing law.

In making the estimates of receipts of the year 1909, the actual receipts and disbursements for the first nine and one-half months being available, the figures for the remaining two and one-half months are based on these ascertained results, and indicate receipts for the year of \$605,047,230. The figures, which must be very nearly accurate, show an estimated deficit at the end of the year of \$69,462,450.

For the year 1910 the appropriations have already been made, and the amount which will be expended can be foretold with approximate accuracy.

In making the estimates for these expenditures I have taken the gross appropriations for the year, \$1,044,000,000, and deducted the appropriations for the Post-Office Department, \$235,000,000; the sinking fund, \$60,000,000; the national-bank fund, \$30,000,000; and Panama Canal expenses, \$37,000,000, and have added the official estimate for the postal deficiency for the year, \$20,000,000, showing a probable total of expenditures of \$700,000,000. In fact, it is hardly possible that this total amount will be expended, as the total expenditures have never in any fiscal year equaled the gross appropriations.

If the pending bill should become a law before the 30th of June next, the customs revenues for the entire fiscal year of 1910 would be collected under its provisions, and the integrity of the probable results shown constitute the crucial point in our investigation.

For the purpose of ascertaining the relative revenue-producing qualities of the Senate bill and the act of 1897, the Committee on Finance has had prepared a statement, which is laid before the Senate this morning. It applies the rates of the Senate bill to the importations of 1907. In other words, it shows the revenue that would have been derived upon the importations made in 1907 if the Senate bill had been in force during that year.

We have selected the year 1907 for the comparison, as this was the last year in which the finances and business of the country were in a normal condition.

The statement shows that if the Senate bill had been in force in 1907 the customs revenue produced by it would have been \$8,000,000 greater than those collected under the Dingley Act, the totals being \$332,000,000 under the act of 1897 and \$340,000,000 under the Senate bill.

This increase of revenue is due to advances in rates on a few articles of luxury, such as wine, spirits, and so forth. It is also due to the substitution made in the bill, in all cases where it was possible, of specific for ad valorem duties. This will prevent undervaluation and consequently increase revenues. This increase will be more marked in the silk schedule than elsewhere.

There are other changes which will be included in the bill that will affect the comparative revenues.

The changes which we propose to make in the administrative act include (1) new definitions of dutiable value and new methods in its proper ascertainment; (2) more efficient collection machinery; and (3) a provision for the creation of a customs court to insure uniformity of decisions in customs cases. The provisions suggested will, in the opinion of the committee, result in the collection of a certain percentage more revenue in the importation of the same articles than was collected under the act of 1897.

The extent of the undervaluations practiced under existing law is variously estimated at from 10 to 25 per cent of the revenue collection. If any considerable portion of this practice is corrected by the provisions I have alluded to, we can certainly safely add five millions to the estimate of revenue in the year 1910, making a total estimate of revenue for 1910, based upon the importation of 1907, \$345,000,000. I have assumed that the importation of 1907 is the proper basis for comparison. We should not lose sight of the fact that there will be approximately 4,000,000 people more in the United States to be provided for in 1910 than in 1907, and if other conditions remain the same there will be a natural increase from this cause. The committee believe that the extent of importations will be greater in 1910 than in 1907.

Growing out of depressed business conditions which have existed since the autumn of 1907, there has been for a month a

large reduction in importations. Stocks of goods of all kinds in the country are now very small, and with the improved conditions that are sure to follow our action, we may expect larger importations in the fiscal year 1910 than in any year in our history.

Business activity and the movement for increased importations has already commenced. We can feel the change in the air. The customs receipts for the thirty-nine business days from March 1 to April 15, inclusive, increased, as compared with the corresponding days in 1908, \$12,031,093.08, or an average daily increase of \$261,545.50. If this rate of increase should continue throughout the next year, it would lead to an increase in the customs revenue for that year of \$81,600,000. This increase, however, seems to be progressive, as the report for the last day which I have, April 16, shows receipts from all sources \$2,072,071.86, as compared with receipts of \$1,283,321.30 on the corresponding day of last year. The total receipts from customs for the first sixteen days of April were \$15,976,106.67, against \$11,030,277.15 in April of last year, and the statement of the 1st to the 16th of April—and I ask the Senate's careful consideration of these figures—shows an excess of receipts over expenditures this year of \$312,929.92, as against an excess of expenditures over receipts of the corresponding period of last year of \$6,618,925.88. There is no incentive for these enlarged importations except improved conditions of the country and reduced stocks of imported merchandise. The character of the legislation proposed furnishes no reason for accelerated imports, as there are practically no rates in either the House or Senate bill which are above the rates imposed by the act of 1897. It must be conceded that the era of prosperity which commenced the first part of March is likely to continue uninterruptedly with the enactment of wise tariff legislation.

Those who do not believe in this continued march of improvement have little knowledge of the recuperative powers of the American people and fail to measure correctly the force of the spirit of confidence which will accompany a guaranty of security and industrial peace.

The estimates which I have made of increased revenues growing out of this change in conditions are most conservative. The estimate I have made for the receipts from customs for the year 1910 is \$345,000,000. The customs receipts in 1906 were \$300,000,000; in 1907, \$332,000,000; and in 1909 they will approximate \$300,000,000. If the same rate of increase which has obtained since the 1st of March should be applied to the eight months of the next fiscal year not covered by the period of improvement in this year, we should then have an increase over the receipts for the present fiscal year, say \$295,000,000, of \$54,401,365, making a total of \$349,401,000, without taking into account the additional sources of revenue provided for in the Senate bill.

It will thus be seen that by taking the importations of 1909 as a basis and making proper allowance for increases, we obtain practically the same figures as those based upon the importations of 1907, confirming the result of my first calculation.

For the year 1911 I have estimated an increase of revenues of \$40,000,000 and a reduction of expenditures of \$35,000,000, a consequent surplus of \$30,000,000. This surplus would certainly continue under normal business conditions. There can be no reasonable question of the sufficiency of the Senate bill to provide adequate revenue.

If the statements I have submitted are approximately correct, the important question arises: In what way is the Treasury to take care of the deficiencies I have indicated for the present and the following fiscal year?

The Treasury has to-day, including the \$74,681,275.89 which it is entitled to receive for reimbursement of canal expenditures, practically \$100,000,000 of available surplus over a necessary working balance. This surplus is likely to be reduced, say, \$6,000,000 between now and the 30th of June by additions to the deficiency for the current fiscal year. This would leave on the 30th of June an available surplus of \$94,000,000. If the estimates which I have made for the year 1910 are accurate, the estimated deficiency of \$45,000,000 in that year would still leave a surplus in the Treasury of \$49,000,000, which would be increased from time to time in the subsequent years.

In estimating the Treasury surplus, I have assumed that what might be called "canal bonds" can be sold from time to time to an amount which will reimburse the Treasury for all payments on account of the canal, and that they are now available for that purpose. Further legislation will, however, be necessary in this bill to secure that result.

The Comptroller of the Treasury has held that \$60,000,000 of the amount paid is not reimbursable under the provisions of existing law. This lack of authority will undoubtedly be remedied by a proper amendment.

Legislation will also be required in the pending bill to change the character of the bonds which may be issued. Existing legislation only authorizes the issue of 2 per cent bonds, which must be sold at not less than par. These could only be purchased by or for the national banks. It would not be possible to sell a considerable amount of bonds of this character at par. It will therefore be necessary to authorize the Secretary of the Treasury to sell bonds of a different class. Bonds redeemable at the pleasure of the Government after a few years could undoubtedly be sold at a rate not exceeding 3 per cent, and the necessary authority should be given in this bill for such issue.

In the estimates for the year 1911 which I have submitted, it will be observed that I have reduced the estimated disbursements for that year \$35,000,000 below the estimated expenditures of 1910, the latter being based upon existing appropriations. I believe, however, that the expenditures for 1910 of \$700,000,000 could also be materially reduced by executive or legislative action, or both.

I am well aware that the accomplishment of the reduction of expenditures I have suggested will be surrounded with great difficulties. The rapidity with which our national expenditures have increased within the last three years is a source of anxiety if not of alarm. Simultaneously with the reduction in receipts of \$60,000,000 from 1907 to 1909, we have had an increase in expenditures of \$120,000,000.

It is but fair to say that when the appropriations for the year 1908 were made the country had not been overtaken by the panic of 1907, and it is quite natural, perhaps, that appropriations should have been made upon the theory that the great prosperity of 1907, with its surplus revenues of \$111,000,000, was to continue indefinitely.

But a different condition existed when the appropriations for the year 1910 were made. It is true that the bills making these appropriations were necessarily passed without careful consideration and without a general knowledge of Treasury conditions. The fact that the appropriations were less than the estimates does not relieve Congress from responsibility for their unprecedented extravagance. No excuse whatever can be found for similar legislation in the future.

The conditions under which appropriations are usually made by Congress are, perhaps, in part responsible for the inconsiderate waste of public money. Each department practically makes its own recommendations independently of all the others and without reference to the total amount of revenues which can be safely appropriated. The committees in charge of the various appropriation bills are required to consider only the needs of the respective departments for which they report appropriations and without reference to the total amount of money available.

It is important in the interests of the public service that a radical change in the procedure with reference to appropriations should be made, and the Senate is pledged to immediate reform in this regard. It should be the function of the Committee on Public Expenditures recently created to take into consideration, long before the appropriation bills are received from the House of Representatives, the estimates and needs of the various departments and report their recommendations to the Senate, in order that responsibility for future extravagancies may be clearly fixed. From an investigation more or less superficial I am myself satisfied that the appropriations made last year could have been reduced at least \$50,000,000 without impairing the efficiency of the public service. There are periods in the life of a nation when the spirit of extravagance pervades the atmosphere and the public money is scattered right and left, often without reference to the results to be secured. I hope and expect to see a radical reform in this direction. We have within the past few years created many unnecessary bureaus and multiplied employees beyond the possibility of efficient work.

No one committee or official has been charged with the duty of attempting to coordinate expenditures with revenue, and extravagant and unwise appropriations have been made without reference to the economical administration of the Government.

In this work of necessary reduction in expenditure and in reform in methods of appropriation to which the Senate is pledged, I am authorized to say that we shall have the earnest support and active cooperation of the President and the administration.

I may be asked what would happen if it should be found that I have been oversanguine or wholly inaccurate in my statements of probable conditions and results. What shall we do if the revenues actually received are less than those I have anticipated, and large deficiencies are threatened? I answer with all the emphasis at my command that it would then be the imperative duty of Congress to reduce expenditures and make them conform to actual revenue conditions, and not to impose

new and onerous taxes. The legislative power of Congress over the revenues and expenditures will not end with the adoption of the pending bill. Congress will be in session again in December and again the following year. The President has the power to call us in special session at any time. The pending bill will, if enacted into law, provide all the necessary revenues required for public expenses upon a liberal scale. No further additional taxes are needed. The imposition of other taxes under these conditions would not only be unwise, but unjust and prejudicial to every interest of the great people we represent.

In the face of the record I have disclosed no political party can afford to place new and unnecessary burdens upon the industries and people of the United States, and I am confident that the party of which I am a member will not assume any such responsibility.

Mr. President, I was surprised on the morning on which this bill was reported to the Senate to have the senior Senator from Virginia [Mr. DANIEL] almost immediately arise in his place and offer an amendment to the bill which, if adopted, would impose from sixty to eighty million dollars a year upon the business and industries of the United States. The Senator from Virginia is the senior Democratic member of the Committee on Finance. His long service upon that committee; his great knowledge of all economic subjects; his position in his party, all make the action of that Senator significant.

The next day the distinguished Senator from Texas [Mr. BAILEY], also a member of the Finance Committee, offered another amendment supplementing the suggestions of the Senator from Virginia, proposing to impose a tax of \$60,000,000 a year upon the incomes of the people of the United States.

Before the enacting clause of this bill was read, and when, by the confession of the two Senators I have named, they were entirely ignorant of its provisions, two Senators suggest adding \$120,000,000 to the burdens which now rest upon the people of the United States. What a change was there, my countrymen.

Mr. President, I was brought up in a Democratic atmosphere. I remember well the lessons which my Democratic ancestors tried to instill into my mind as to the policies and the principles of the Democratic party. I shall not attempt to enumerate all of them, but the contention was always prominent that the party was the party of economy in expenses and always opposed to unnecessary taxation. In the Democratic platform for the year 1840, when Martin Van Buren was nominated for President, the following resolution appears:

Resolved, That it is the duty of every branch of the Government to enforce and practice the most rigid economy in conducting our public affairs, and that no more revenue ought to be raised than is required to defray the necessary expenses of the Government.

In 1846 Robert J. Walker, whom I conceive to be the ablest advocate of a tariff for revenue only this country has produced, announced as his platform the following principles:

That no more revenue should be collected than is necessary for the wants of the Government, economically administered.
That no duty be imposed on any article above the lowest rate which will yield the largest amount of revenue.

These ideas have been promulgated from every Democratic platform in this country from that time to this. The Republican party has been assailed from every stump and in every part of the United States for extravagance, for the imposition of unnecessary, and therefore unjust, taxes upon the people of the country. What do we now see? Not an attempt to secure greater economy by the Democratic leaders in the Senate, but propositions to impose \$120,000,000 of additional taxes; and for what purpose? They can have no other purpose, or perhaps I should say they could have no other effect, than to promote and incite further extravagance in appropriations and in expenditures.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Rhode Island yield to me?

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Rhode Island yield to the Senator from Texas?

Mr. ALDRICH. Yes; I yield.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. President, I assume that the Senator from Rhode Island does not desire to misrepresent my attitude.

Mr. ALDRICH. I do not. I was coming to a statement which the Senator afterwards made in submitting his proposition.

Mr. BAILEY. Then I will refrain from further interruption until I see if the Senator from Rhode Island is as fair when he reaches that statement as he appears to be now.

Mr. ALDRICH. I will try to do so. It is true that the Senator from Texas qualified his statement about the \$60,000,000 of

revenue that would be obtained from an income tax by saying that it was his purpose, if that should be adopted, to reduce the taxes which are levied by the pending bill, or by existing law, upon other articles which might be designated as "articles in common use" or "necessaries of life." Is that a fair statement?

Mr. BAILEY. That is a fair statement. Not exactly, but in substance. If I were permitted to control the procedure, I would make the two propositions in one motion. I would provide for the reduction of the duties on articles of common necessity, and then I would supply the deficiency of revenue created by a remission of those duties to the people by the levy of an income tax. Of course, if I could not have my way, then I would vote for each proposition separately.

Mr. ALDRICH. I understood that to be the position of the Senator from Texas, and I desire very briefly to examine his proposition to reduce the taxes \$60,000,000 below the amount which it is estimated will be raised by this bill or by existing law. How will it be done, as a matter of practical operation? Can anyone suggest to me any method by which it can be done?

Robert J. Walker, in giving his idea of a revenue tariff—and it is the idea of every man who has ever treated this question intelligently and from a logical standpoint—laid down the principle—

That no duty be imposed on any article above the lowest rate which will yield the largest amount of revenue.

Consider that, gentlemen—

That no duty be imposed on any article above the lowest rate which will yield the largest amount of revenue.

If duties should be reduced in the pending bill to that level, what would happen? You would increase the revenues, instead of reducing them, and your income tax would be more unnecessary than it is at this moment, because you would have a large surplus revenue—

Mr. BAILEY rose.

Mr. ALDRICH. I hope the Senator will let me proceed for just a moment longer.

Mr. BAILEY. I should like to have the Senator put in the RECORD another extract from Robert J. Walker's report.

Mr. ALDRICH. The Senator from Texas can put in the whole report later on if he likes.

Mr. BAILEY. I should like to see the two go in together, but I will take occasion to do that later.

Mr. ALDRICH. It must be patent to Senators that if we are to reduce the rates imposed by the pending bill to a revenue basis it means an absolute increase of revenue rather than a diminution. The only way the revenue can be reduced substantially is by adopting one of two courses—either by the adoption of prohibitory duties, which will stop the revenue, or by placing manufactured articles that compete with articles produced in this country on the free list. I suggest that the Senator from Texas give that proposition his attention. That is the only way that the revenues to be derived from this bill can be reduced. There is, it is true, another method, adopted in the construction of the Wilson bill, the only Democratic tariff with which this country has been cursed since 1846. What did that bill do? What was the effect of the legislation in that case? It did reduce revenues. How? By putting out the fires and the furnaces and stopping the machinery of production; by prostrating the industries of the United States and destroying the purchasing power of the American people. You can reduce expenditures by legislation which shall send this great and prosperous country into a state of decay and dissolution. Are you gentlemen upon the other side ready to do this?

Perhaps you would like to reduce the revenues for the purpose of imposing an income tax and thus taking the first steps for the destruction of the protective system. That attempt has been made before; in fact, every time there has been a Republican tariff measure before the Senate, within my recollection.

The traditions of your party, the interests of the great American people are all against this policy of yours. I shall be very curious to see what the Senator from Virginia and the Senator from Texas, with all of their ability and all of their ingenuity, can say in defense of the taxes—taxes which they seek to impose when there can be no necessity for their imposition.

I will ask to have printed as a part of my remarks the detailed tables I send to the desk.

The tables referred to follow on next page.

Statement of receipts and disbursements of the United States.
[By fiscal years 1897 to 1908, inclusive, and nine months of 1909.]

RECEIPTS.

	1897.	1898.	1899.	1900.	1901.	1902.	1903.
Customs.....	\$176,554,126.65	\$149,575,062.35	\$206,128,481.75	\$233,164,871.16	\$238,585,455.99	\$254,444,708.19	\$284,479,581.81
Internal revenue:							
Spirits.....	81,847,927.23	90,158,802.80	98,285,548.04	110,692,847.66	115,078,617.15	121,773,239.20	131,827,431.76
Fermented liquors.....	32,471,786.99	39,515,421.14	68,640,183.64	73,550,754.49	75,669,907.65	71,988,902.39	47,547,856.08
Tobacco.....	30,710,190.83	36,230,522.37	52,484,113.58	59,355,084.89	62,481,907.13	51,937,925.19	43,514,810.24
Stamp taxes.....			43,837,929.66	40,963,811.53	40,194,641.27	14,174,101.54	
Other sources.....	1,658,919.24	4,995,895.18	10,189,386.59	10,765,478.19	13,755,690.57	12,005,953.78	8,420,026.09
Total internal revenue.....	146,688,774.29	170,900,641.49	273,437,161.51	295,327,926.76	307,180,668.77	271,880,122.10	230,810,124.17
Sales of public lands.....	864,581.41	1,243,129.42	1,678,246.81	2,836,882.98	2,965,119.65	4,144,122.78	8,925,811.22
Other miscellaneous.....	23,614,422.81	83,602,501.94	34,716,730.11	35,911,170.99	38,954,098.12	32,009,280.14	36,189,657.20
Aggregate receipts.....	\$47,721,905.16	\$405,321,335.20	\$515,960,620.18	\$567,240,851.89	\$587,685,337.53	\$662,478,233.21	\$660,396,674.40

	1904.	1905.	1906.	1907.	1908.	1909 (nine months).
Customs.....	\$261,274,564.81	\$261,798,856.91	\$300,251,877.77	\$332,233,362.70	\$268,113,130.29	\$216,926,093.56
Internal revenue:						
Spirits.....	185,779,720.54	135,234,711.29	143,168,779.80	157,782,395.38	286,206,268.03	104,095,530.60
Fermented liquors.....	49,063,458.77	50,334,259.40	55,574,006.45	59,342,450.20	59,807,542.22	41,502,716.93
Tobacco.....	44,655,801.85	45,689,189.28	48,721,734.62	51,302,777.91	49,862,755.01	37,613,145.30
Other sources.....	3,385,138.29	2,837,880.88	1,685,692.04	1,239,149.36	2,834,561.44	1,447,144.62
Total internal revenue.....	232,904,119.45	234,095,740.85	249,150,212.91	269,666,772.85	251,711,126.70	184,658,537.45
Sales of public lands.....	7,453,479.72	4,859,249.80	4,879,833.65	7,878,811.13	9,731,560.23	6,352,912.33
Other miscellaneous.....	38,999,585.42	43,520,837.29	40,172,197.34	53,361,387.37	53,570,301.31	33,014,471.88
Aggregate receipts.....	\$404,631,749.40	\$444,274,684.85	\$594,454,121.67	\$663,140,334.05	\$601,126,118.53	\$440,952,015.22

DISBURSEMENTS.

	1897.	1898.	1899.	1900.	1901.	1902.	1903.
CIVIL ESTABLISHMENT.							
Legislative:							
Congress.....	\$4,858,147.94	\$4,163,301.21	\$4,506,223.21	\$4,417,666.67	\$4,430,578.99	\$4,542,376.31	\$4,682,324.33
Public Printer.....	3,843,918.37	3,894,609.48	4,124,673.87	4,730,211.11	5,812,387.69	6,156,258.37	5,917,410.11
Library of Congress.....	545,646.82	266,632.21	262,739.68	306,867.29	424,756.87	469,403.09	590,668.39
Miscellaneous.....	789,535.08	1,114,034.41	2,283,736.85	517,471.86	543,791.25	162,164.10	1,000,346.34
Executive office:							
Salaries and expenses.....	97,044.21	101,721.03	113,227.06	110,416.34	115,378.05	112,360.38	247,723.29
Civil Service Commission.....	96,950.13	97,429.87	97,365.76	97,403.61	97,362.59	101,224.84	99,928.94
Department of State:							
Salaries and expenses.....	138,684.81	138,975.25	247,594.17	141,371.22	156,015.39	186,467.44	178,098.28
Foreign intercourse.....	2,076,876.84	2,485,581.13	2,624,019.80	3,214,802.65	3,317,900.35	2,765,734.01	3,204,522.01
Treasury Department:							
Salaries and expenses.....	3,039,944.79	3,074,323.46	3,186,817.00	3,277,786.67	3,895,011.92	3,533,329.24	3,846,800.94
Independent Treasury.....	602,369.65	593,635.66	599,685.25	682,811.85	686,610.52	683,544.89	704,203.54
Mint establishment.....	1,176,516.13	1,128,172.18	1,488,270.92	1,479,648.25	1,906,475.17	1,535,666.06	1,456,220.57
Territories.....	196,277.88	92,591.56	164,634.17	89,923.95	224,241.84	165,734.85	261,591.08
Internal Revenue Service.....	8,678,929.54	4,902,511.15	4,499,146.87	4,991,677.41	5,990,282.72	8,536,348.58	10,603,813.60
Collecting revenue from customs.....	7,075,372.05	7,152,276.58	7,361,562.83	7,467,692.48	7,713,418.82	7,967,473.86	8,468,710.19
Refunds excess of deposits and drawbacks.....	3,728,144.36	4,928,412.97	7,628,999.95	10,387,538.85	12,976,088.25	10,650,417.26	9,596,844.77
Revenue-Cutter Service.....	945,189.93	1,066,478.04	1,040,594.64	1,229,337.57	1,256,550.61	1,203,637.12	1,441,614.26
Public Health and Marine-Hospital Service.....	620,606.90	709,248.04	788,043.21	982,495.77	1,240,192.37	1,234,264.51	1,356,455.87
Life-Saving Service.....	1,507,340.63	1,537,740.00	1,528,895.39	1,579,127.73	1,650,907.17	1,667,688.48	1,746,841.19
Coast Survey.....	380,865.52	478,007.84	659,412.43	828,156.05	758,298.04	888,832.07	865,215.78
Light-House Establishment.....	3,890,090.45	3,331,256.37	3,118,833.50	3,556,940.70	3,638,898.53	4,181,403.39	4,537,315.67
Bureau of Fisheries.....	428,827.27	465,070.66	433,211.42	520,209.90	516,897.66	540,691.17	580,751.69
Immigration Service.....	501,607.83	379,093.25	445,560.21	508,319.54	492,224.18	602,336.41	610,421.38
Steamboat-Inspection Service.....	339,561.18	340,009.04	331,678.33	316,140.85	254,929.90	344,490.06	448,605.88
Engraving and Printing.....	1,130,261.93	1,129,261.93	1,612,926.18	1,807,169.59	2,058,698.21	2,653,522.43	2,782,348.50
Public buildings—construction.....	3,758,795.67	3,760,684.57	3,861,194.30	6,346,657.85	6,781,362.78	4,919,574.17	7,679,721.24
Fuel, furniture, and expenses, public buildings.....	1,981,110.87	2,145,982.12	2,284,733.76	2,235,099.97	2,425,144.62	2,417,282.17	2,282,909.92
Expositions.....	114,781.81	166,972.68	432,774.35	71,279.03	861,013.95	218,660.86	1,099,290.16
Miscellaneous.....	8,845,984.97	6,824,423.23	4,723,177.49	4,669,550.19	4,703,280.59	3,985,019.68	4,614,659.01
War Department:							
Salaries and expenses, civil.....	1,713,825.25	1,752,473.78	2,390,391.36	2,679,700.57	2,687,199.80	2,194,319.30	2,224,031.29
Public buildings and grounds in Washington.....	150,528.84	145,394.89	163,719.53	195,860.32	191,024.03	190,710.74	840,196.50
Navy Department:							
Salaries and expenses.....	410,933.43	426,496.99	412,630.60	425,234.66	478,325.56	498,897.02	498,762.44
Interior Department:							
Salaries and expenses.....	4,809,041.83	4,767,499.10	4,700,358.50	4,767,172.82	4,728,737.91	4,742,480.28	4,933,929.83
Public lands service.....	1,860,676.21	1,747,242.08	1,870,614.45	2,034,164.39	2,438,549.64	2,398,905.07	2,620,643.73
Geological Survey.....	422,366.82	440,004.96	493,330.80	555,389.75	697,320.49	740,121.53	897,866.44
National parks.....	40,158.63	20,747.76	25,238.89	24,422.07	35,161.22	73,609.68	101,118.32
Beneficiaries.....	394,758.66	438,993.97	465,422.35	494,001.00	598,501.03	681,321.53	1,235,578.74
Census.....	25,817.73	758.54	57,433.35	945,347.03	7,816,748.00	2,920,317.97	1,353,914.24
Colleges for agriculture.....	1,056,000.00	1,104,000.00	1,162,000.00	1,200,000.00	1,200,000.00	1,200,000.00	1,200,000.00
Reclamation Service.....							268,517.23
Miscellaneous.....	206,179.42	152,106.42	202,079.89	145,174.38	1,229,765.80	571,573.10	457,485.49
Post-Office Department:							
Salaries and expenses, department proper.....	901,267.84	869,966.13	887,946.90	928,557.99	986,574.57	1,031,488.29	1,391,393.00
Deficiency in postal revenues.....	11,149,296.13	10,504,040.42	8,211,570.08	7,230,778.79	4,954,762.21	2,402,152.52	2,768,919.20
Mail transportation, Pacific railways.....	1,569,153.38	857,797.45	587,545.31	598,976.18	606,534.08	592,682.31	701,646.87
Miscellaneous.....	1,646.98	514.88	54,271.13	2,863.00	1,917.01	22,161.50	48,105.27

* Includes \$64,751,223.75 paid into the Treasury on account of indebtedness of Pacific railroads; and the miscellaneous receipts for subsequent years to June 30, 1908, include approximately four to six millions paid in each year on the same accounts.

† Includes \$29,000,000 on account of "Treaty obligations between the United States and Spain.

‡ Transferred to Department of Commerce and Labor in 1903.

§ Includes \$4,549,368.26 payment in adjustment of Pacific railroad accounts.

|| Includes \$1,000,000 on account of bubonic plague, Territory of Hawaii.

¶ Includes \$540,641 on account of repairs and new buildings at the Executive Mansion.

Statement of receipts and disbursements of the United States—Continued.
DISBURSEMENTS—continued.

	1897.	1898.	1899.	1900.	1901.	1902.	1903.
CIVIL ESTABLISHMENT—continued.							
Department of Agriculture:							
Salaries.....	\$290,566.97	\$313,291.95	\$316,955.80	\$331,810.48	\$318,788.11	\$369,363.60	\$450,664.69
Building.....						5,000.00	1,000.00
Animal Industry.....	636,385.02	735,299.39	862,414.33	887,191.13	970,080.20	1,035,096.31	1,367,373.66
Purchase of seeds.....	145,673.02	127,193.26	118,689.38	136,412.76	148,969.55	272,383.49	263,157.62
Forest Service.....	12,402.75	25,510.58	17,366.72	40,750.89	80,674.62	114,814.96	224,654.75
Plant industry and cotton boll-weevil investigations.....	28,276.25	29,061.34	27,354.17	38,345.34	49,805.96	71,482.59	129,352.03
Agricultural experiment stations.....	746,730.13	756,016.96	757,924.03	767,744.08	777,153.69	785,723.69	796,670.01
Weather Bureau.....	848,949.64	908,814.39	1,039,060.60	989,776.42	1,063,244.00	1,156,773.69	1,259,121.70
Miscellaneous.....	316,496.24	298,120.01	353,610.17	433,819.44	555,231.42	769,351.29	840,362.30
Department of Commerce and Labor:							
Salaries and expenses.....							34,473.84
Bureau of Labor.....	170,698.76	179,772.26	170,902.08	173,009.74	169,921.35	176,202.49	182,084.49
Department of Justice:							
Salaries and expenses, proper.....	317,675.06	371,145.58	386,132.50	436,733.03	435,608.17	473,903.04	589,144.39
Salaries and expenses, United States courts.....	6,344,797.27	6,760,165.32	6,281,525.66	5,937,592.38	6,294,006.71	6,288,840.13	7,350,740.51
District of Columbia:							
Salaries and expenses.....	6,508,539.34	6,319,725.84	6,735,039.22	7,108,581.57	8,748,323.04	9,363,742.00	8,584,037.32
	95,968,325.72						
Less repayments to Pacific Railroad sinking funds.....	5,567,057.90						
Total civil establishment.....	90,401,267.82	96,520,505.17	119,191,255.90	105,773,190.16	122,282,003.10	113,469,323.91	124,934,304.74
MILITARY ESTABLISHMENT.							
National defense.....		7,034,112.30	8,889,291.81	1,269,546.58	900,233.00		192,801.69
Emergency fund.....			3,000,000.00	1,040,383.70	360,583.08	42,362.20	76,187.43
Pay Department.....	13,723,532.36	21,443,090.19	69,588,579.42	31,951,556.59	38,243,279.21	36,915,284.17	28,615,763.10
Extra pay, war with Spain.....			3,005,000.00	940,321.37	249,324.61	82,538.85	157,191.75
Subsistence Department.....	1,406,430.12	5,922,441.36	17,203,367.99	10,407,631.76	12,764,977.27	6,420,827.28	5,419,793.20
Quartermaster's Department.....	6,720,465.60	18,831,850.56	81,782,869.78	48,234,609.92	48,222,948.50	31,725,860.32	30,822,802.69
Medical Department.....	790,628.25	494,287.34	2,186,283.86	2,837,594.09	2,553,168.24	850,602.41	1,320,023.99
Ordnance Department.....	7,702,888.08	10,786,774.65	19,396,663.76	10,790,926.13	11,631,915.70	11,155,777.33	10,637,105.75
Engineer Department.....	375,833.93	774,589.07	1,815,096.04	555,933.09	841,094.75	755,091.75	1,082,265.56
Rivers and harbors.....	13,682,704.81	20,785,049.96	16,082,541.42	18,718,864.82	19,544,473.71	14,947,980.74	19,590,082.21
Military Academy.....	234,974.80	280,085.70	161,771.89	199,902.66	398,891.67	257,104.92	490,980.17
Military posts.....	352,947.33	399,190.37	352,919.12	804,972.73	648,919.77	1,053,242.45	1,824,432.09
National homes.....	2,330,801.20	2,286,943.73	3,055,783.18	2,849,631.39	3,276,708.85	3,236,434.40	3,938,294.04
Reimbursing States and Territories, expenses of troops, Spanish war.....			1,281,878.07	1,131,881.04	964,186.77	599,431.34	217,852.35
Refunding to States expenses incurred in raising volunteers.....						1,053,652.42	6,364,609.31
Panama Canal.....							9,985.00
Miscellaneous.....	1,629,511.41	2,953,585.06	2,539,208.13	3,041,011.91	4,014,992.07	3,176,025.00	7,869,334.82
Total military establishment.....	48,950,267.89	91,992,000.29	229,841,254.47	134,774,767.78	144,615,697.20	112,272,216.08	118,629,505.15
NAVAL ESTABLISHMENT.							
National defense.....		20,622,415.20	6,197,701.02	1,045,064.40	203,895.74	24,999.72	1,872,734.22
Emergency fund.....			3,856,263.95	812,406.39	555,395.72	114,019.42	175,132.01
Increase of the navy.....	14,539,911.36	10,758,388.73	10,277,217.89	14,398,254.94	15,202,578.53	19,798,144.29	26,667,104.25
Yards and docks.....	1,575,829.90	1,774,571.02	2,449,408.54	4,476,759.21	5,294,178.98	5,701,780.29	6,404,410.50
Equipment.....	1,455,594.46	1,843,121.78	4,682,491.03	3,329,324.20	4,060,522.73	5,144,548.32	5,439,182.18
Navigation.....	168,002.80	174,406.11	292,372.45	418,617.24	473,590.51	580,547.94	862,062.11
Construction and repair.....	2,292,056.16	3,008,220.42	7,371,269.70	5,781,245.81	7,810,405.49	6,998,828.98	7,783,546.78
Ordnance.....	887,139.00	1,652,784.44	4,271,101.46	3,659,203.82	3,097,203.27	2,549,000.51	3,474,681.63
Steam engineering.....	1,130,229.12	1,496,417.36	3,445,043.35	2,531,549.71	3,542,627.02	3,253,231.78	3,613,724.40
Supplies and accounts.....	1,971,560.31	3,349,543.07	5,703,607.97	3,518,421.26	3,573,119.61	3,957,819.29	5,701,472.94
Medicine and surgery.....	311,829.48	300,661.05	340,441.61	286,798.93	403,893.29	415,870.92	541,577.20
Marine Corps.....	1,053,676.64	1,174,974.32	1,830,463.57	1,798,871.61	2,318,064.18	2,718,621.95	3,246,688.47
Naval Academy.....	273,759.45	223,485.32	286,170.05	400,692.31	725,723.08	872,698.13	1,320,562.87
Pay of navy.....	8,311,599.35	9,067,558.07	11,927,034.50	11,863,099.11	13,245,775.37	13,017,036.61	14,969,881.86
General account of advances.....		2,258,701.75	118,624.69			1,905,889.92	17,634.10
Miscellaneous.....	590,858.26	1,123,736.16	892,892.47	1,632,768.78		756,090.17	527,638.66
Total naval establishment.....	34,561,546.29	58,823,984.80	63,942,104.25	55,953,077.72	60,506,978.47	67,803,128.24	82,618,084.18
Indian Service.....	13,016,802.46	10,994,667.70	12,805,711.14	10,175,106.76	10,896,073.35	10,049,584.86	12,935,168.08
Pensions.....	141,053,164.63	147,452,368.61	139,394,929.07	140,877,316.02	139,323,621.99	138,488,559.73	138,425,646.07
Interest.....	37,791,110.48	37,585,056.23	39,896,925.02	40,100,333.27	32,342,979.04	29,108,044.82	23,556,348.82
Aggregate disbursements.....	365,774,159.57	443,368,582.80	605,072,179.85	487,713,791.71	509,967,353.15	471,190,857.64	506,099,007.04
CIVIL ESTABLISHMENT.							
Legislative:							
Congress.....		\$4,683,840.49	\$4,841,274.41	\$4,877,902.26	\$5,684,349.09	\$6,684,980.40	\$5,196,859.16
Public Printer.....		6,501,562.40	6,369,108.52	5,746,177.00	5,895,278.71	6,394,810.82	4,327,006.63
Library of Congress.....		575,960.89	607,786.41	589,817.51	586,428.36	613,609.68	542,801.53
Miscellaneous.....		91,268.03	91,387.29	88,643.90	96,368.04	95,485.52	192,614.60
Executive Office:							
Salaries and expenses.....		133,406.03	133,953.08	142,350.98	152,031.43	166,460.95	130,372.32
Civil Service Commission.....		166,579.60	172,454.24	236,430.53	235,363.48	238,062.55	192,034.80
Department of State:							
Salaries and expenses.....		182,618.15	191,580.09	196,950.07	455,268.12	444,345.07	448,570.52
Foreign intercourse.....		4,191,884.86	2,621,815.18	2,842,800.13	3,250,692.71	3,301,217.55	2,449,835.43
Treasury Department:							
Salaries and expenses.....		3,564,094.95	3,776,151.14	3,894,449.24	3,973,673.22	4,057,952.02	3,100,885.11
Independent Treasury.....		753,953.15	746,793.05	750,302.58	771,749.46	819,404.88	600,350.43
Mint establishment.....		1,401,372.74	1,299,100.68	1,279,838.08	1,817,511.77	1,476,745.33	1,037,253.63
Territories.....		181,336.13	254,106.25	192,643.04	872,807.73	5,417,335.62	175,728.35
Internal Revenue Service.....		5,829,699.71	5,034,922.00	5,747,880.69	5,490,880.71	5,825,010.87	4,077,080.63
Collecting revenue from customs.....		8,665,636.37	9,115,499.44	8,997,669.41	9,436,752.63	9,580,626.25	7,609,563.06

* Organized by act of February 14, 1903.

* Includes \$3,000,000 for relief of distress in the Philippines.

* Includes \$5,000,000 on account of "public schools, Oklahoma."

Statement of receipts and disbursements of the United States—Continued.

DISBURSEMENTS—continued.

	1904.	1905.	1906.	1907.	1908.	1909 (nine months).
CIVIL ESTABLISHMENT—continued.						
Treasury Department—Continued.						
Refunds excess of deposits and drawbacks	\$8,483,693.53	\$9,303,551.62	\$9,427,500.64	\$8,785,524.08	\$10,297,062.41	\$6,847,397.40
Revenue-Cutter Service	1,524,763.53	1,610,812.54	1,469,595.17	1,532,040.10	1,714,487.20	2,477,690.68
Public Health and Marine-Hospital Service	1,424,362.73	1,290,092.32	1,200,098.80	1,441,298.16	1,575,829.60	1,138,316.52
Life-Saving Service	1,779,443.69	1,840,505.21	1,843,012.24	1,795,481.66	2,009,149.79	1,748,754.26
Engraving and Printing	2,756,163.65	2,866,340.62	2,914,726.84	3,347,859.93	3,302,400.27	2,276,174.71
Public buildings—construction	10,188,592.82	10,934,783.10	8,736,004.19	9,361,486.62	9,341,364.55	9,359,858.97
Fuel, furniture, and expenses, public buildings.	2,280,456.71	2,681,669.33	3,472,755.29	3,015,569.35	3,244,273.58	2,531,236.56
Expositions	10,037,267.18	644,086.10	132,421.69	283,838.65	205,165.13	78,971.28
Miscellaneous	2,261,581.14	3,016,863.62	3,012,599.01	4,792,201.17	5,334,718.72	4,750,073.78
War Department:						
Salaries and expenses, civil	2,237,622.56	2,118,650.01	2,190,282.55	1,866,353.42	1,878,565.33	2,103,397.67
Public buildings and grounds in Washington	252,135.06	260,595.33	301,093.35	365,661.37	301,871.51	
Navy Department:						
Salaries and expenses	559,148.60	695,264.34	692,519.95	738,359.95	743,136.14	575,770.34
Interior Department:						
Salaries and expenses	4,992,867.41	5,070,856.72	4,984,280.59	4,990,590.95	4,900,797.54	3,833,837.44
Public-lands service	2,762,991.91	2,554,245.85	2,420,448.82	3,514,587.50	3,064,621.48	2,933,243.36
Geological Survey	917,231.33	982,166.16	999,687.05	1,030,718.52	881,568.93	724,050.13
National parks	114,204.06	59,522.18	56,001.14	80,789.91	118,641.32	102,179.84
Beneficiaries	1,157,658.37	571,372.65	671,227.01	633,503.34	673,149.69	610,476.66
Colleges for agriculture	1,200,000.00	1,200,000.00	1,200,000.00	1,200,000.00	1,500,000.00	1,750,000.00
Reclamation Service	1,611,650.19	3,882,020.53	7,256,926.75	12,795,346.80	11,126,042.02	7,172,926.57
Buildings for Senate and House, and power plant.	756,452.05	933,690.42	1,160,914.87	1,575,035.20	2,960,746.06	1,898,185.58
Miscellaneous	505,421.89	513,930.90	380,769.11	257,448.68	249,845.74	258,962.27
Post-Office Department:						
Salaries and expenses, department proper	1,404,466.87	1,444,537.48	1,505,203.27	1,510,410.71	1,627,471.55	1,246,402.97
Deficiency in postal revenues	6,502,530.86	15,065,257.00	12,673,294.39	7,629,382.81	12,838,040.94	17,930,059.70
Mail transportation, Pacific railways.	739,706.12	740,641.75	741,182.43	773,253.05	761,789.45	187,411.51
Miscellaneous	7,896.18	34,086.45	103,237.68	184,725.33	14,277.86	228,562.51
Department of Agriculture:						
Salaries	458,575.06	475,154.02	792,099.55	846,806.27	920,421.82	812,594.18
Building	28,496.32	101,000.00	368,055.10	533,000.00	460,154.25	21,970.40
Animal Industry	1,250,588.47	1,363,997.29	1,566,222.94	676,711.59	939,515.86	1,226,141.59
Meat inspection	257,904.13	286,209.94	258,717.82	2,015,630.62	2,629,099.71	2,158,522.21
Purchase of seeds	328,927.58	533,345.33	1,110,893.10	217,622.43	282,166.08	231,077.52
Forest Service	77,706.45	279,350.17	175,304.53	1,701,222.55	3,877,123.84	3,631,839.21
Plant industry and cotton boll weevil investigations	809,923.26	809,126.52	794,036.95	563,635.66	665,013.08	686,510.06
Agricultural experiment stations	1,227,147.57	1,334,877.66	1,875,298.80	1,330,737.78	1,253,013.75	1,033,066.93
Weather Bureau	1,176,167.66	1,351,403.58	1,375,298.80	1,342,888.31	1,317,310.71	1,190,883.87
Miscellaneous	1,176,167.66	1,351,403.58	1,203,059.05	1,254,437.70	1,616,345.30	1,546,310.00
Department of Commerce and Labor:						
Salaries and expenses	289,856.98	522,063.94	566,441.89	569,558.23	865,048.94	701,694.16
Bureau of Labor	185,082.61	176,256.13	185,319.75	161,897.66	175,297.66	121,900.43
Bureau of Standards	160,378.61	190,158.64	155,866.90	155,745.16	189,166.87	184,890.15
Census Office	1,219,765.38	1,410,870.02	1,166,879.30	1,228,578.31	1,239,264.25	875,251.45
Coast Survey	744,675.23	926,412.61	854,060.31	853,147.25	962,745.89	712,443.99
Light-House Establishment	4,904,124.63	4,449,658.25	4,343,840.93	4,941,920.50	6,870,052.52	4,237,281.02
Bureau of Fisheries	593,449.47	660,079.96	684,283.84	616,983.66	757,474.72	642,873.08
Immigration Service	1,844,796.59	2,126,355.15	2,066,728.38	2,021,200.80	3,178,554.78	2,790,382.31
Steamboat Inspection Service	389,741.73	396,260.49	462,115.24	439,213.28	570,631.49	393,872.73
Miscellaneous	253,211.64	36,038.06	39,922.19	35,880.36	41,931.35	36,779.02
Department of Justice:						
Salaries and expenses, proper	635,139.78	688,025.03	704,548.62	829,562.25	861,330.40	744,013.15
Salaries and expenses, United States courts	7,477,527.18	7,664,275.53	7,899,348.47	8,619,928.44	8,232,515.88	6,157,643.63
District of Columbia:						
Salaries and expenses	9,392,025.10	11,678,356.49	11,487,249.80	11,370,801.55	12,184,505.10	12,430,997.03
Total civil establishment	136,602,202.92	143,033,728.82	142,894,471.46	153,045,913.13	175,420,408.57	145,413,775.18
MILITARY ESTABLISHMENT.						
National defense	63,225.22	12,953.60	44,437.34	9,997.51	3,693.52	13,754.85
Emergency fund	27,418,380.58	31,372,083.65	28,566,749.23	32,195,042.68	32,982,606.10	33,876,034.05
Pay Department	275,800.60	584,985.40	370,928.55	350,600.40	131,427.94	11,560.60
Extra pay, war with Spain	5,446,558.73	5,541,892.65	5,509,333.18	5,540,021.18	6,439,915.89	5,883,513.55
Subsistence Department	28,958,225.61	29,972,958.41	29,008,111.29	30,491,412.05	34,008,199.13	30,401,720.94
Quartermaster's Department	1,338,716.28	1,138,701.55	1,668,499.12	1,012,927.44	1,455,816.15	1,869,860.09
Medical Department	12,815,736.42	14,001,722.11	12,391,843.85	11,457,263.51	11,547,508.63	9,975,740.78
Ordnance Department	1,824,384.97	2,280,947.00	2,397,746.05	2,658,722.43	4,568,593.89	4,201,472.35
Engineer Department	22,546,055.94	22,813,864.53	25,955,402.28	23,309,760.85	30,157,649.01	26,784,432.58
Rivers and harbors	414,712.72	477,890.39	933,073.09	1,012,237.14	1,602,185.74	1,121,193.97
Military Academy	3,118,087.68	2,846,933.82	1,908,624.10	1,548,193.43	1,912,635.75	2,160,272.31
Military posts	4,404,270.09	3,907,685.26	3,715,785.05	4,114,534.31	3,945,098.33	4,895,377.45
National homes	39,305.72	200,060.93	218,065.23	260,815.85	562,710.50	45,543.95
Reimbursing States and Territories expenses of troops, Spanish war.	2,534,633.51	1,103,853.83	65,624.24	65,624.24	97,466.02	
Refunding to States expenses incurred in raising volunteers	50,164,500.00	3,918,819.83	19,379,373.71	27,198,618.71	38,093,425.29	22,520,377.74
Panama Canal	3,837,316.51	5,871,824.04	5,256,428.52	7,866,809.63	4,821,521.10	2,616,555.49
Miscellaneous						
Total military establishment.	165,199,910.58	126,093,894.07	137,326,066.08	149,775,084.20	175,840,452.99	146,397,619.91
NAVAL ESTABLISHMENT.						
Emergency fund	91,752.40	13,749.44	157.12	15,009.16	31.08	
Increase of the navy	39,638,188.84	47,418,091.03	42,606,067.50	29,588,343.88	27,468,655.76	5,858,342.32
Yards and docks	7,696,779.34	8,911,207.78	6,405,566.52	5,491,564.61	5,772,537.50	1,493,570.19
Equipment	6,429,908.79	5,893,851.37	7,211,690.00	5,999,183.54	10,386,602.83	3,030,077.13
Navigation	1,499,496.59	1,758,711.20	1,706,961.12	2,348,547.31	3,742,246.86	891,372.76
Construction and repair	8,512,234.78	7,944,886.71	7,932,792.75	7,804,943.36	7,192,521.87	2,601,566.22
Ordnance	3,795,316.37	3,940,574.96	4,116,891.42	4,882,305.37	8,030,376.41	3,597,051.82
Steam engineering	3,763,322.61	4,143,684.10	4,555,273.64	5,094,072.99	5,549,055.84	1,937,211.62
Supplies and accounts	6,317,737.24	6,198,930.26	6,160,003.15	6,880,001.71	8,617,939.45	2,428,438.64
Medicine and surgery	717,814.56	796,419.42	832,267.33	799,402.41	1,453,106.66	482,856.38
Marine Corps	3,798,984.05	3,944,263.22	4,153,707.32	5,002,328.48	5,598,670.77	1,071,689.82
Naval Academy	1,890,997.40	2,748,867.07	1,812,850.66	1,366,029.78	980,628.45	213,500.02
Pay of navy	17,858,964.77	18,264,719.47	21,770,803.17	21,692,616.32	25,492,613.45	7,411,160.09

* Organized by act of February 14, 1909.

† Includes \$40,000,000 for the property of the New Panama Canal Company and \$10,000,000 to the Republic of Panama.

‡ Includes \$1,987,805 for relief and replacing military stores at San Francisco.

§ Includes \$1,631,442 for roads in Alaska, cyclone sufferers, and improvements at Soldiers' Home.

Statement of receipts and disbursements of the United States—Continued.

DISBURSEMENTS—continued.

	1904.	1905.	1906.	1907.	1908.	1909 (nine months).
NAVAL ESTABLISHMENT—continued.						
General account of advances.....		\$3,161,400.51			\$6,778,385.33	\$53,881,998.49
Miscellaneous.....	\$954,603.81	2,410,951.64	\$1,209,232.70	\$163,820.44	973,724.89	1,366,986.17
Total naval establishment.....	102,956,101.55	117,550,308.18	110,474,264.40	97,128,469.86	118,037,097.15	86,265,771.67
Indian service.....	10,438,350.09	14,236,073.71	12,746,859.08	15,163,608.41	14,579,755.75	12,786,162.64
Pensions.....	142,559,266.36	141,773,964.57	141,034,561.77	139,809,514.31	153,892,467.01	123,504,072.67
Interest.....	24,646,489.81	24,590,944.10	24,808,576.27	24,481,158.34	21,426,138.21	16,014,114.61
Aggregate disbursements.....	582,402,821.31	567,278,913.45	563,784,799.06	578,903,747.75	659,196,319.68	530,381,516.68

NOTE.—The disbursements from the Treasury for the "Naval establishment" are charged primarily under the law to the account "General account of advances" created by act of June 19, 1878 (20 Stat. L., 167). While the total of the naval disbursements is shown in this statement, of which \$53,881,998.49 stands in "General account of advances," the charges against the detailed heads shown herein can be determined only after final adjustment by the Auditor for the Navy Department of the accounts involved in the advances made from "General account."

TREASURY DEPARTMENT,
DIVISION OF BOOKKEEPING AND WARRANTS,
April 15, 1909.

Customs receipts March 1, 1909, to April 15, 1909, inclusive, compared with same period of 1908.

	1909.	1908.	Daily increase in 1909.
March 1.....	\$1,009,331.32	(*)	\$1,009,331.32
March 2.....	783,544.78	\$768,144.13	15,400.65
March 3.....	1,506,111.34	1,040,902.64	465,208.70
March 4.....	(*)	177,419.58	177,419.58
March 5.....	1,507,442.35	1,481,711.30	25,731.05
March 6.....	1,800,249.24	709,571.38	1,090,677.86
March 7.....	(*)	1,037,889.33	1,037,889.33
March 8.....	958,697.18	(*)	958,697.18
March 9.....	808,430.51	736,238.52	162,191.99
March 10.....	1,316,566.95	806,302.44	510,264.51
March 11.....	1,217,485.19	1,053,511.40	163,973.79
March 12.....	974,726.68	850,172.46	124,554.22
March 13.....	912,174.51	710,056.40	202,118.11
March 14.....	(*)	600,829.99	600,829.99
March 15.....	1,493,983.06	(*)	1,493,983.06
March 16.....	1,118,984.62	660,006.21	458,978.41
March 17.....	1,239,658.78	990,452.32	249,206.46
March 18.....	1,131,632.04	980,388.67	151,243.37
March 19.....	982,016.55	811,076.32	170,940.24
March 20.....	863,447.73	822,949.60	40,498.13
March 21.....	(*)	493,103.28	493,103.28
March 22.....	702,461.47	(*)	702,461.47
March 23.....	890,271.78	840,670.27	49,601.51
March 24.....	1,206,602.60	860,148.50	346,454.10
March 25.....	1,069,108.20	960,760.72	108,347.48
March 26.....	722,411.15	750,563.40	28,092.25
March 27.....	974,831.11	827,069.45	147,761.66
March 28.....	(*)	723,280.50	723,280.50
March 29.....	1,078,671.34	(*)	1,078,671.34
March 30.....	934,887.58	673,312.84	261,574.74
March 31.....	1,238,008.40	788,636.27	449,372.13
April 1.....	940,043.52	855,504.69	84,538.83
April 2.....	1,188,515.50	967,880.81	220,634.69
April 3.....	1,172,371.11	750,615.34	421,755.77
April 4.....	(*)	639,147.33	639,147.33
April 5.....	1,217,551.92	(*)	1,217,551.92
April 6.....	1,109,648.86	753,430.48	356,218.38
April 7.....	1,710,078.91	943,902.10	766,176.81
April 8.....	1,001,244.02	847,426.00	153,818.02
April 9.....	1,719,683.44	684,958.20	1,034,725.24
April 10.....	984,355.75	830,558.30	153,797.45
April 11.....	(*)	902,200.05	902,200.05
April 12.....	802,178.18	(*)	802,178.18
April 13.....	981,113.66	851,369.83	129,743.83
April 14.....	1,106,345.49	662,783.90	443,561.59
April 15.....	1,044,842.84	1,031,811.64	13,031.20
Total.....	43,607,709.67	31,576,616.59	

* Sunday.

* Holiday.

* Deficit.

Net increase in 1909 for the period..... \$12,031,093.08
Average daily increase..... 251,545.50

TREASURY DEPARTMENT,
DIVISION OF BOOKKEEPING AND WARRANTS,
April 15, 1909.

Panama Canal, proceeds of bonds issued for the work and disbursements by fiscal years 1903 to 1908, inclusive, and for nine and one-half months of fiscal year 1909.

	Proceeds of bonds issued.	Disbursements.
1903.....		\$9,985.00
1904.....		50,164,500.00
1905.....		3,918,812.83
1906.....		19,379,373.71
1907, proceeds of bonds:		
Principal of bonds.....	\$30,000,000.00	
Premium.....	1,210,817.95	
Total.....	\$31,210,817.95	27,108,618.71

Panama Canal, proceeds of bonds issued, etc.—Continued.

	Proceeds of bonds issued.	Disbursements.
1908, proceeds of bonds:		
Principal of bonds.....	\$24,631,980.00	
Premium.....	735,788.67	
Total.....	\$25,367,768.67	\$38,093,929.04
1909 (9½ months), proceeds of bonds:		
Principal of bonds.....	30,000,000.00	
Premium.....	731,008.21	
Total.....	\$30,731,008.21	\$23,225,644.43
Total.....	\$56,100,776.88	\$61,319,573.47

The disbursements shown herein contain:

Payment for property, New Panama Canal Company..... \$40,000,000
Payment to Republic of Panama..... 10,000,000
Toward the project of the canal..... 10,000,000

Total..... 60,000,000

Which sums have been construed by the Comptroller of the Treasury as not reimbursable by bonds.

Mr. DANIEL. Mr. President, a deficit in our revenue confronts us. After a period of flush times, of extravagant expenditures, of enormous revenues, and of great lakes of surplus, the question of finance, now demanding attention, is brought to a focus by a deficit. The chairman of the Committee on Finance, who has just spoken, thinks the deficit which he does not provide for is some sixty-nine or seventy million dollars. He might find a very good opening at that deficit, which he has not provided for, by looking at the suggestions of some of his Democratic colleagues. He would feel then as if he was going home, for he tells us that he was raised in a Democratic atmosphere, in which rigid economy was advised, with no more revenue to be raised than would be measured by the economical expenditures of the Government. I am afraid he has forgotten that teaching so long that it will be a surprise to behold him advising the people to consider it.

BOND ISSUES.

The last Congress, which ended March 4 of the present year, appropriated no less than \$1,044,359,260.30. Buckle and tongue no longer meet. It is realized by everybody that something must be done, and done at once, to cure the evil and meet the future. Issuing bonds and thereby piling up greater expenses upon the future has often been resorted to. You may look out for bonds nowadays, whether in a bill raising revenue or in an appropriation bill to dispose of it. The last Congress put a hundred million of certificates to raise money in an appropriation bill, commonly called the "sundry civil bill," which is to cover the expenses of the officials of the Government, and for other purposes. The House bill, which is now before us, offers to raise \$150,000,000 more of money. This is palatable food for the Government, but not very wholesome for finance. I am glad to know that the Finance Committee has erased this provision from its recommendations, no doubt after reading the wise suggestions of Robert J. Walker.

It leaves, however, \$150,000,000 to provide more than the House bill provides for. At present we may cast the question of bonds out of consideration, and in that I thoroughly agree with the chairman, the Senator from Rhode Island.

REDUCTION OF EXPENSES AND RAISING OF REVENUE INDISPENSABLE.

Another way, and one that commends itself to all as to the future, is to reduce expenses. It is the first time I ever heard that shibboleth from that direction, but I welcome it, and again I will go down the line arm in arm with the distinguished re-

cruit who has just joined us. This is the imperious mandate of the situation, and it has already commanded certain dignified attention from "the powers that be" in the Senate, and it will no doubt have general cooperation from all of their Democratic associates, even if they were not permitted to join in the councils from which the evolution came. It is indispensable now to provide such revenues for the Government as will be sufficient for the obligations that have been imposed upon it. We would not only be in default, but in disgrace without it.

Our Government is greater than any party, old or new, and greater than any platform, old or new. No man who serves it truly should permit any projection of view from his own lips or from other lips to stand in the way of this sovereign and commanding obligation. A time may come when individual views may be permitted to predominate with justice and service to the people, but we can serve the people no better now than by square and honest discharge of the obligation that is present with us. Let us, therefore, consider the items of this bill when we come to them, without favor to items that prohibit and prevent revenue, and with favor to those which produce it measurably and proportionately to the great object of good faith.

REPUBLICAN PANIC OF 1907.

Our recent history is advisory and instructive. Not yet two years ago, in 1907, in the midst of boasted prosperity and a magnificent surplus, in the high noon of the highest protective tariff that this country has ever produced, a financial panic burst forth, widely pervasive and more desolating than any that ever swept over us. While the Senator is looking both to the past and the present to animadvert upon Democratic derelictions, let us, in this place of our innocence, proclaim that we had nothing to do in producing the panic, nothing to do in making the laws that brought it about, but have simply been at all times ready to join those who would do something to relieve it. That panic succeeded upon a period of unsurpassed extravagance, both of governmental expenditure and in the style of American living.

HIGH TARIFF AND SURPLUS REVENUE NOT PREVENTIVE OF DEPRESSIONS.

One fact remains in conspicuous view and abides in many painful memories. It is this: That a protective tariff, however high, a great surplus, however enormous, do not prevent trade revulsions, and do not protect the masses of the people from the hardships of depressed condition, either in manufacture or in commerce. It is no panacea for many, and certainly not for all, the ills that man is heir to. An aftermath of that panic is not overpassed. I concur with my distinguished friend in his American optimism. We down South have been living on optimism for forty years, and are glad to live on it still with all the additions that have come thereto from the hard and continuous work of our people.

But it is not to be overlooked that thousands and tens of thousands of workmen, to whom the distinguished Senator has made no allusion, whether they be clerks, artisans, or manual laborers, remain out of employment. The great cities are congested with many who want work and find it not, and society is yet affected by the inevitable lowered condition on the public weal.

HIGH EXPENSE OF LIVING CONTINUES.

Another conspicuous fact has been revealed to us, that the expenses of living have not fallen, but, on the contrary, show a firm and ascending scale of prices for the necessities and luxuries of life. The Government of the United States has increased the salaries of its high officials, and of many less high officials, to assist in smoothing their way in the encounter with high prices. But hotels, apartment houses, and public houses of entertainment maintain or increase their prices. Market places and grocery stores are out of affinity with pocketbooks, and those who go to their salaries for their domestic supplies find the breach as between the resources of finance and those of the stall and counter still existing and still enlarging. That higher tariffs which will prevent or depress trade will be administered for correction is a surprising prescription. What shall we eat? What shall we drink? Wherewithal shall we be clothed? These are questions to be answered. It is impressing the housekeepers and the family caretakers of this country more and more as they look around the domestic circle to be provided for. These are two features of the conditions under which we are about to levy the approximate of a billion of dollars of annual taxes upon the whole people of the country.

NO ADMINISTRATION AGAINST EXTRAVAGANCE.

Still another remarkable fact is to be noted. This Government not until recently, and then but lightly, paid regard to the admonitions of the times. We had none from the distinguished committee that is now going into distant generations to find something about the party we represent of which to make cavil.

In fact, until recently aroused those who applaud extravagant protective views regarded economy as too coarse and too common a thing for statesmen to pay much attention to. But the wisest have been startled into the resumption of their studies, and a certain sober-mindedness is taking the place of careless confidence and of hurrahing glorification.

LAST SESSION OF CONGRESS THE MOST EXPENSIVE SINCE 1865.

It may not be assuring to note that at the late session, which opened in December last and adjourned March 4, more money was appropriated by this Congress, which opened its suggestions with the deriding of Robert J. Walker, than was ever before appropriated in a single session in the history of our Government except in the year 1865, when flagrant war had reached the top notch of expenditure.

Receipts and expenditures of the United States from 1861 to 1867, inclusive.

	Net ordinary.	
	Receipts.	Expenditures.
1861.....	\$41,476,299	\$66,650,213
1862.....	51,919,261	469,570,242
1863.....	112,094,946	718,734,276
1864.....	243,412,971	864,939,101
1865.....	322,031,158	1,295,099,290
1866.....	519,949,564	519,022,356
1867.....	462,846,680	346,729,326

CHAIRMAN TAWNEY'S STATEMENT OF EXPENSES.

Let me read here, too, what Mr. TAWNEY, the chairman of the House committee which considered this bill in that body, has to say on the subject of expenses:

The increase in national expenditures may be attributed to several causes, but the two primary causes leading to this result have been, first, the popular and executive demands upon Congress for appropriations from the Federal Treasury for the exercise of rights and functions belonging exclusively to the States, and, second, the abnormal and unnecessary war expenditures in time of peace. This I shall endeavor to prove later on in my remarks.

So says Chairman TAWNEY, of the House committee. This is a candid, public confession that our enormous extravagance has come from the popular and executive demands upon Congress. There was no Democrat in executive control, and if any benefit can be derived from this assertion, let the people receive it.

The appropriations—

He continues—

made at the last session of Congress were larger than those made in any other session, and the appropriations carried in the several appropriation bills passed at this session of Congress are very considerably in excess of what they were at the last session. Yet in both sessions of Congress they are far below the amount estimated by the executive departments for public expenditures during both fiscal years.

Then comes something excusatory:

The responsibility for this can not be charged to the Congress of the United States. If the estimates submitted during the past two or eight years had been appropriated for, and if the amounts proposed in bills introduced and demanded by public sentiment had passed, which amounts carried in bills now pending before this House exceed a half billion dollars, the deficit, instead of being in the neighborhood of \$150,000,000, would exceed \$500,000,000. Had it not been for the Congress and the conservative element in that body, we would have long since been meeting these enormously increased expenditures from the proceeds of the sale of bonds. That the people have thus far been saved from that unfortunate situation is not due to any effort or recommendation of the executive branch of the Government, but to the Congress of the United States.

The excuse of the Republican Congress is not unlike that of Clive, when he returned from India—that there was so much that he could have taken and did not, that what he was surprised at was his moderation. No matter whether it was little or whether it was much, it was Republican, and I do not say this in order to carry a political dispute into a financial consideration.

But my friend on the other side was never more happy in his brief statement of conditions than in looking around for something in the Democratic party to find fault with, spurred, perhaps, because he could find nothing in this situation to lay at their doors. The Republican party has always been fond of monopoly, and I congratulate my distinguished friend that he enjoys a monopoly of representing those in this situation who are wholly responsible for it.

MILITARISM.

There is a feature of this enormous expenditure, Mr. President, which I will leave others to point out, whose testimony will be more acceptable to the majority in this Chamber.

In the course of his remarks Mr. TAWNEY showed that it was our extravagant militarism that has added more to these ex-

penditures than anything else. We are a military nation, and ought to be. All nations ought to be prepared to fight for themselves if necessary. But they ought not to have absurd scares, such as the Japanese scare of recent fashion, to plunge them into too speedy and too great expenditures for the military side of our public service. I do not think there are broad Americans who are well informed anywhere in this country in any respectable number who ever were afraid or are now afraid of having Japan overrun and take this country. Those who fancied they thought or who did think so have never deigned to give us the reason of the thought that was in them.

Abraham Lincoln said in the olden times that all the nations of the earth could never get a drink out of the Ohio River. I do not think there are many of them who are compelled to take a drink out of any California river, and if they did they would certainly very promptly and unmistakably get the quickest, the completest, and the most conclusive setback that they were ever introduced to in all their history. There is no European nation, neither is there any eastern nation that has so little sense as to want to pick a quarrel with the United States of America. If there were such, there are a good many Americans who could advise them that they had better take a second sober thought before trying it.

Now, let us hear what Chairman TAWNEY, of the House, has said about our military expenditures:

By far the greater part of our national expenditures are for the military side of our Government, on account of wars that have occurred or in preparing for wars that may come. Considering the subject from the standpoint of appropriations made at this session, from which expenditures are to be made, we find that five great annual supply bills are devoted solely to these expenses, as follows:

Army	\$101,197,470.34
Fortifications	8,170,111.00
Military Academy	2,531,521.33
Navy	136,935,199.05
Pension	160,908,000.00

In addition, the sundry civil, the legislative, executive, and judicial, and even the District of Columbia bills carry considerable sums chargeable to military expenditures, and under the chapter of "Permanent appropriations" there are also large amounts directly chargeable to war, or the results of war, including interest and sinking-fund charges on account of our civil war debt. These sums, together with the amount for the army and navy in the general deficiency act, all amounting to about \$116,000,000, added to the amount carried by the five bills I have mentioned, bring the total of these appropriations that are chargeable to this session of Congress up to the enormous amount of \$525,742,301.72, which, deducted from \$1,044,014,298.23, the whole apparent sum of appropriations for the session, leaves only about 50 per cent of our total proposed expenditures to be devoted to civil government.

The growth of appropriations for military purposes, including only those for the military and naval establishments carried in the army and navy acts, and without reference to the large sums for pensions, fortifications, and other incidents of war to which I have referred, for the eight-year period prior to the Spanish war, contrasted with the eight-year period ending with the fiscal year 1910, affords a startling exhibit, and one that I commend to the thoughtful consideration of my countrymen.

Army appropriations.

1891-1898.

1891	\$24,206,471.79
1892	24,613,529.19
1893	24,308,499.82
1894	24,225,639.78
1895	23,592,884.68
1896	23,252,608.09
1897	23,278,402.73
1898	23,129,344.30

Total 190,607,380.38

Average annual appropriations, \$23,825,922.54.

1903-1910.

1903	\$91,730,136.41
1904	77,888,752.83
1905	77,070,300.88
1906	70,396,631.64
1907	71,817,165.08
1908	78,634,582.75
1909	95,382,247.61
1910	101,197,470.34

Total 664,117,287.54

Average annual appropriations, \$83,014,660.84.

Naval appropriations.

1891-1898.

1891	\$24,136,035.53
1892	32,541,654.78
1893	23,543,385.00
1894	22,104,061.38
1895	25,327,126.72
1896	29,416,245.31
1897	30,562,660.95
1898	33,003,234.19

Total 220,634,403.86

Average annual appropriations, \$27,579,300.48.

1903-1910.

1903	\$78,856,363.13
1904	81,876,791.43
1905	97,505,140.94
1906	100,336,679.94
1907	102,091,670.27
1908	98,958,507.50
1909	122,663,885.47
1910	136,935,199.05

Total 819,224,237.73

Average annual appropriations, \$102,403,029.71.

Mr. TAWNEY says:

It will be seen from these figures that the average annual appropriations for the army have leaped from less than \$24,000,000 per annum for the eight-year period immediately preceding the Spanish war to an average of more than \$83,000,000 for the eight-year period ending with the appropriations made by this Congress, and that during the same periods the annual average for naval appropriations has increased from a little more than \$27,500,000 to more than \$102,400,000.

The increase in appropriations for the army for the periods named exceeds \$473,000,000, a sum sufficient to cover the whole cost of constructing the Panama Canal, on the basis of the latest estimates for that gigantic work, and with nearly \$150,000,000 to spare.

The increase in the sums Congress has voted for the navy for these same periods amounts to \$598,589,333.87, a sum greatly in excess of the total appropriations for the support of the whole Government for any fiscal year prior to that of 1898.

The combined excess for the army and navy, thus exhibited for the eight-year periods named, amounts to \$1,072,099,741.03, a sum exceeding by more than \$158,000,000 the total interest-bearing debt of the United States. So immense has this cost of militarism grown in these last eight years over the eight-year period ending scarce ten years ago that the sum of the excess is greater even than the stupendous sum of all of our appropriations made at this session of Congress.

SENATOR HEMENWAY'S STATEMENT OF EXTRAVAGANT ESTIMATES.

The Hon. James A. Hemenway, of Indiana, who, after serving with credit in the House of Representatives, was elected to this body by his State and served with equal credit as a member of the Committee on Finance, closed his term on the 4th of March last. The day before he submitted the following statement, which I reprint from the RECORD. It shows to congressional credit the reduction of executive recommendations in the last eight years of \$274,127,413.05. He said:

The press of the country, in view of the alarming deficit which the Treasury reports show from day to day and month to month, is filled with editorials criticising Congress for its extravagance, and, with no defense made by Congress, the people of the United States are led to believe that Congress alone is responsible for the large appropriation and expenditure of money.

I show by the statement which follows that Congress in the last seven years reduced the estimates sent to us by the Executive over \$274,000,000.

Mr. CLARKE of Arkansas. Will the Senator read it? I should like to hear it.

Mr. HEMENWAY. It is a short statement. I will read it:

Estimates for expenses of the Government submitted to Congress by the Executive, including supplemental and deficiency estimates, and appropriations made thereunder for the fiscal years 1903-1910.

Year.	Estimates.	Appropriations.	Reduction of estimates.
1903 ^a	\$826,478,318.47	\$800,624,496.55	\$25,853,821.92
1904	765,456,776.30	753,058,506.02	12,398,270.28
1905	830,974,206.79	781,172,375.18	49,801,831.61
1906	835,260,367.21	820,184,634.96	15,075,732.25
1907 ^b	907,144,696.87	879,589,185.16	27,555,511.71
1908	943,190,643.68	920,798,143.80	22,392,499.88
1909	1,079,449,288.96	1,008,397,543.56	71,051,745.40
1910 ^c	1,100,000,000.00	1,050,000,000.00	50,000,000.00
Total	7,287,954,298.28	7,013,824,885.23	274,129,413.05

^a Includes \$50,130,000 in estimates and appropriations for purchase and to begin construction of the Panama Canal.

^b Includes \$26,348,281.40 submitted in special document for the Panama Canal.

^c Estimated.

DEMOCRATS EXCLUDED FROM COMMITTEE MEETINGS.

This, Mr. President, is a prodigious bill. It contains 302 pages and carries about a million dollars a page.

The Democratic Members of this body never saw it or heard it read, for it was not read at the one meeting of the Finance Committee which they attended. It was not brought here until April 12, when it was reported by the chairman of the Finance Committee with over 300 amendments. None of these amendments were we permitted to see before they were presented here, and not one of them did we have the opportunity to vote upon before they were brought here with the committee's

approbation. Many witnesses appeared, as stated, before the Senate Finance Committee. We heard not one of them. Not one of them were we permitted to cross-examine. There were some of them, if the press be correct, whom I should like very much to have had the opportunity to cross-examine. I should like to have asked some of them, especially those interested in iron and steel, why one of the committee, after their departure, put a duty on sulphate of ammonia, which is the food for the plants of this country, and is a specific burden upon all our farmers. But it was a closed shop.

I can not regard the method pursued as either good or fair government. Each one of us has at home constituents who are as much interested as any other constituent body of any Senator. Besides, we are all Americans. We are all as anxious for justice to be done to all of our country as any of those who assume the prerogative of excluding us from the opportunities of which they avail themselves most elaborately. It is a disadvantage to the whole public, for, having the desire to do the right thing and so far as we may the wise thing, we not only wish, but need, all the light that can be found upon these important matters to guide us through these labyrinthian schedules. The indignity of such a course is toward the people of the United States. It is also toward the Senate of the United States. We have the honor to be Members of the only body in this country where there remains free debate and where the Members in their rules and in their conduct have in nothing more distinguished themselves in the minds of the American people than by creating the reputation that here everybody would be heard. We must be heard in committee as well as upon the floor, and the invitation of our colleagues for light in all things except in their exclusive conduct, that we could go into the Senate and thrash these things out, is an invitation which we are forced to accept from having been denied a share in their councils.

The organization of the House of Representatives as an American institution does not permit any kind of free range to the Members, as of old was the custom of the fathers of this country and of their descendants for many generations. It is not permitted in that body for a Member to offer an amendment to a bill levying upon his constituents with others \$300,000,000, and to ask and get a vote upon it. I shall not forget the proper rule of the Senate that one House must not indulge in disrespectful allusions to another. But the facts of the organization of each House are upon an open page of American history, and I may advert to the existence of those facts and admonish and advise my people as to what their Representatives have to encounter under this free Constitution of the United States.

I introduce a witness from that House. He is the chairman, or was the chairman at one time, of the Democratic organization there—the Hon. CHAMP CLARK, of Missouri. This is what he has to say as to conditions in that body:

The Democratic Members did as much work during the "hearings" as did the Republican Members, and were as patriotic and conscientious as they. In such a joint labor nobody would have placed in the bill all he wanted. Nor is it at all probable that even a single Republican Member of the committee or of the House is entirely satisfied with the Payne bill as reported, to say nothing of the Democratic Members. In such a joint labor there could have been no danger of our outvoting them. If the whole committee could have united on a bill, either in whole or in part, under the peculiar circumstances in which we find ourselves, it would have greatly expedited the passage of the bill, thereby relieving the country of the long and wearisome weeks, perhaps months, of business uncertainty and suspense. If there is delay in the passage of the bill and business stagnates by reason thereof and financial loss results from it, let the blame be placed where it properly belongs, upon the head of the Republican party.

Having spent nearly three months in framing their bill, they graciously called in the Democratic Members, and in precisely twelve minutes reported it back to the House without one moment's discussion, without changing a word, without even reading the title—an astounding demonstration of the fact that we live in a fast age and are traveling at a rapid gait.

This happened on March 18, and no member of the minority had ever seen the bill or any paragraph thereof till noon on Wednesday, the 17th of March, and had not the remotest idea of its provisions except by the merest guesswork. In fact, it was currently reported in the public press that so fearful were the Republican Members that the Democratic Members or some other American citizen might secure some knowledge of the contents of the Payne bill that its authors not only kept it under lock and key, but employed armed guards to keep watch and ward over their precious bantling—an absolutely superfluous performance, as many parts of it are utterly incomprehensible even after careful study. And yet this bill, which was too sacred for any eyes except the 12 majority Members and a few of their trusted friends, contains 234 large pages and deals with tariff taxes on about 4,000 articles of everyday consumption, influencing the interests, prosperity, and happiness of 90,000,000 American citizens and involving our trade relations with the whole world. We have had only five days in which to consider and report upon a bill which they spent nearly three months in preparing.

No gentleman ever cares for the association of other gentlemen when his presence is not welcome. There is not a man in this House, I am sure, who would ever obtrude himself upon

any assemblage. We are neither so vain nor so unreasonable as to conceive that the exclusion in this body or in the other had any application to the personality excluded. For what reason that can be proclaimed did the Senate committee exclude its Democratic confrères from holding meetings with that body? It was not from any disrespect of them. It was not that they do not practice the amenities, the civilities, and the proprieties of life in all companionship. What could it have been done for—that they wished to derive some information that they did not wish to impart to others? But I will not probe the matter further. It was certainly not for the convenience of this body. It may have served for the nonce the convenience of some of those members; but I can not think that those gentlemen would appropriate and monopolize to themselves for their own sake conveniences and benefits that they would not readily share with their colleagues, whether Democratic, Republican, or what not.

Therefore it is impossible to conceive of any motive save of some advantage to be gained, either in debate upon this subject or in its result, and as I am no further concerned with it, I leave it as it stands, but commend the matter to the consideration of a body which was planned by the Constitution of this country to extend equality to every Member, which made that equality basic in the organic law. That equality sends here from New England 12 Senators to exercise properly those conferred faculties. They would not possess them in proportion to inhabitants, but do rightly possess and energetically employ them. These facts should remind them, while in the enjoyment of their privileges, that a Senator in this body from the smallest State, whether in territory, whether in wealth, or whether in political influence or not, whether in the fashion of the times or not, has exactly the same right that any other and every other Senator has. When any one of those Senators takes away from me or my people, or from any other Senator in this body, the right of equal communication, of equal opportunity, and of equality in all respects which belongs to the positions which we occupy, it is a thing that should receive proper notice.

Mr. CULBERSON. Mr. President—

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Virginia yield to the Senator from Texas?

Mr. DANIEL. With pleasure.

Mr. CULBERSON. I do not think the proposition of the Senator from Virginia needs any support in authority, strong as it is in itself, and yet if he will permit me I will read a short paragraph from Jefferson's Manual, which is published by the Senate as a part of its rules:

A committee meet when and where they please, if the House has not ordered time and place for them, but they can only act when together, and not by separate consultation and consent—nothing being the report of the committee but what has been agreed to in committee actually assembled.

PRIMAL NECESSITY OF REVENUE TO AVOID QUANDARY OF DEFICITS.

Mr. DANIEL. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Texas for reading so apposite an illustration and declaration of the law of the matter to which I have referred. But, Mr. President, the average American has studied, and if not studied has observed by instinct, the fundamental principles of fair play and square deal. We need not go to any law book to find the vindication of my assertion. It is instinctive to the American man, and I leave it to his contemplation.

This measure is styled "An act to provide revenue, to equalize duties, and encourage the industries of the United States." "To provide revenue." That is, of course, the first declared purpose of the bill. It is its primal and its essential purpose. Revenue is the paramount word we have to deal with. It is indispensable and controlling. We should vote first of all to raise revenue, and wherever there was a fitting place for revenue to be placed, there I would place it. A deficit existing at this time would require this, if there might be at other times a different disposition. I shall also vote, Mr. President, to relieve every burden of taxation of the people that can be eliminated with just regard to the conditions in which we legislate. I would conserve and not destroy any of the plants and industries which have upon their foreign competitors already existing tariffs which raise reasonable revenues which we need. If we do not do this and if we are won away from it by the fascination of the word "free," which always captivates the ears of the American, we shall find ourselves in a quandary of deficits, with interest-bearing bonds quickly upon their heels.

DEMOCRATIC PLATFORM CALLS FOR GRADUAL REDUCTIONS.

Our declarations and our conditions alike require something more than this. The Democrats at Denver have declared for a gradual reduction of the schedules of the protective tariff.

Those words "gradual reductions" show that every Democrat who used them had an intelligent view of our situation, and that none of them either contemplated or desired that there should be a wholesale removal of the present, or prostration of the entire, protective system. Nothing more than this would be possible without a declaration. Nothing more than this gradual process is possible with a declaration, whether the Democrats had the majority or the Republicans. It is an economic truth. It is also a historical truth. It is sometimes overlooked by the speaker when addressing assemblies, and when speaking ideals rather than realities; but it is true that when a great and widespread system of any kind has been established all over a country, of many years' duration, no man but a madman would attempt to leap out of it by one spring or bound, or to deal with it otherwise than by those patient degrees which are the absolute dictates of both patriotism and wisdom.

If we determine to go downstairs at all, we can not get downstairs by leaping off the roof to the ground, but we must go down one step at a time, just as we went up, otherwise we destroy things rather than help them and bring general catastrophe.

We must respect labor. There is no idea in the American heart, whether it beats in a Democratic breast or a Republican, than that we must respect the men who toil. The parties have both been willing to add to the tariff the labor difference in cost of production between this and European countries, and such a tariff would not oppose the American people anywhere, but conserve the interests of everyone. The farming classes as well as mechanical classes would alike share to a degree in this provision, and those who did not share would be glad to contribute their share for the welfare of our whole people. These ideas are Democratic from the root up. They belong to patriotism, and all refer to labor.

GENERAL CONDITIONS OF GREAT NATIONS.

Now, Mr. President, let us glance, if I may be permitted to do so, at the general conditions which we confront in the affairs of other nations. They are different from any that any previous Congress has ever confronted. The great nations of the world are protecting and developing their own resources behind high-tariff walls. I except England. The industries of the nations are intrenching themselves behind high trust walls. The railroad systems are already consolidated or consolidating in vast continental lines behind the walls of combination or amalgamation. The individuals who are in business everywhere are organizing themselves in small numbers as corporations, and frequently consolidating into trusts. All units of power that participate in the intelligent affairs of life are growing and expanding. Great powers have been organized in the republics of the world, as well as in the monarchies, that are greater and more influential than those who occupy the highest public stations. Great cities are growing greater and greater. Their immense buildings contain the numbers of large towns under one roof and those roofs climb, year by year, higher up in the sky.

These processes are universal. William Draper, a student, a philosopher, and an author, said that "when the iron rail was laid the bones of the giant grew." When the steam engine went forth upon the iron rail the greatest materialistic evangel of peace and plenty and of concord that ever went forth on this earth started upon its journey.

I may add to this that when the telegraph came along the nerves of the giant grew.

When the telephone came the voice of the giant grew vaster in volume and farther in range.

When Marconi invented his wireless signal system behold a miracle like that of the whispering wind, which carries the thought, the voice, and the heart of man as it listeth.

No man or set of men, Democratic or Republican, American or foreigner, can altogether change these conditions. They belong to a period of human development; and, like atmosphere and climate, they belong to the world which we inhabit. But even these may be modified by the genius of man. Sanitation and healthfulness may be established where there was poison and death. Equalization must be measurably made to displace disparity. There is a process of gravity in business, and in systems, as there is in the natural world. Graduated steps as recognized in the Democratic platform must be taken in reforms.

The pioneers and skirmishers of science are exploring and conquering the air. Ere long the heavens will be filled with commerce, and both peace and war will look over the earth and its vast concerns from an aerie in the skies. Guns to shoot upward at the flying fleets are already invented and lying in waiting. But tariffs will have a new question to deal with as well as war.

I love to look forward, as in our dreams we may fancy better things than have happened, and I believe that in time unshackled trade will come to all the children of man. That time is not yet. The great nations with tariff barriers are building battle ships and molding long-range guns while they talk of peace to satisfy their philosophic cravings and go occasionally to The Hague and hold conventions. The great Russian Empire made a proclamation through its Emperor inviting the nations to disarm. The next phase was the Russo-Japanese war and a wind up with America as the conciliator and the scene of conciliation, a matter of which she may well be proud.

The great truth still abides with us. Deplore it as we may, "the dream of the world is peace, but the history of the world is war."

THE AMERICANS ARE CLOSER TOGETHER THAN HERETOFORE.

The great fact that should now give hope and comfort to us as we look out upon a world of armament with eyes glancing as if they discerned war in the distance, is the fact that the American people are more together, not only in established systems, but in unison of thought and purpose, than they have ever been in all their history. It is easy to talk of good times that have gone; it is easy to talk of good times that will come. Do we not often overlook good things that are present; that carry on them the seeds of betterment to come.

There is no man living in America to-day, whether he comes from North, South, East, or West, who would not rather live here than anywhere else; and if he has had disadvantages at times, he takes them as the accidents of life that fall to all people and looks just as hopefully to the future as if he had been every time a winner.

Our people are alike in their local institutions, and they have become alike in their national aspirations. The subject of commerce taxation now before us is a subject upon which their widest differences have been exhibited throughout many decades of contention.

But, Mr. President, it was illustrated this morning in an accidental way that we are getting closer and closer together, though we do not all the time notice it, when the Republican leader of the Senate made as his invocation a quotation from Robert J. Walker, to which he invited our attention, and when, Walker like, he tuned his harp in Democratic phrase and held out to the people how economy would bring prosperity again to pass. It was illustrated notably in the last campaign by the speeches of President Taft on the necessity of revision.

While debate here will always disclose contentious tongues, it is, nevertheless, a national fact that the underlying thoughts of both the Republican and Democratic parties are more alike than has been the case since 1856, when the Republican party first spread out its banner. You must look at the platforms of the parties to discover what they were thinking about when they wrote them. The shortest platforms are always the safest, the wisest, the truest, and the best, but in this age, when the parties have gotten into making encyclopedias and catalogues of platforms, you are more apt to find some inept expressions.

But look at the platforms for last year, and observe some of the elements which are moving in the same channel. Look at the Democratic platform. It is not radical on the tariff. It wants a few more things on the free list than the Republicans; but the Republican committee will put more things on the free list than were there before.

MR. BRYCE'S COMMENT ON AMERICA.

Mr. Bryce, who is a great commentator on our institutions, says of the United States a wise thing. "America," he says, "is a country where things turn out better than they ought to." That is true. We have often proclaimed the ruin of everybody who did not agree with us at that particular time. We have done things that challenged ruin and that seemed to expedite it. Come around next year. The sun is shining, the birds are singing; the world has not run off of its axis, and is still whirling round and moving on.

Mark Twain made an observation which I think must have been inspired after reading a tariff debate. "This country," he says, "is a country where every parallel of latitude wants to be the equator." Just at this particular moment the equator is exhibited on the political maps as the point in tariff adjustment where an American citizen can get the highest protection on everything he wants to sell and can find the freest trade on everything he wants to buy.

This bill shows that. Look at the raw materials that are put on the free list and then look at the raw materials that are taxed. You discover as soon as you read the list—which the hour of the day and the temperature alike forbid that I should read to you now, but you will have time to study it and dwell

with it—the things that are on the free list are those things which many people in this country who have large influence in this equatorial region want to buy, and hence they immediately see the beauties of free trade. Then look on those that are taxed. Those who support them argue that what they have to sell will get a greater consideration in the market when foreigners are taxed to bring them here. A great many Republicans and Democrats will be found before this debate is over insisting on some of their things being taxed for protection, and insisting that some other things shall be left untaxed for free trade and for protection also, and vice versa, North and South.

There will be on those lines sometimes a union of logical thought and sometimes a union produced by the fact that on some of these articles there is a tariff now which yields revenue and puts it into our Treasury, and also is not extravagant.

No man, let him be Democrat of the strictest sect, or let him be Republican of the strictest sect, who looks at an empty treasury, but will be moved by necessity toward measures and items which reasonably, justly, and fairly will make its contribution to that treasury.

I am consoled by the fact that this tendency is a just one and moves both Democrats and Republicans. I am not of the protection school, but I recognize the fact, as all must, that all protection can no more be removed in a lump than a mountain range could be so moved. Everybody who thinks must recognize this, whether he likes it or not. None know it better than the Democrats at Denver knew it, and they indicated it by pointing to gradual reductions while they were looking forward.

You may move a log cabin with a horse and a man or two, but try to move a stone-and-iron skyscraper, with 2 stories underground and 10 to 20 stories above ground and a tower in the sky. That is another matter. In some cases it is before us in this tariff.

SHERMAN, GARFIELD, ALLISON, AND WEBSTER.

Some general thoughts, familiar to Republican as well as to Democratic thinkers, are pertinent. Let me read, and let my distinguished friend from Rhode Island hear some words of John Sherman. To quote him would seem no stranger from me than the quotation from Robert J. Walker by the chairman of the Finance Committee, nor as much so. Here is a Roland for his Oliver:

JOHN SHERMAN'S VIEWS ON THE INCIDENTAL PROTECTION OF LARGE TARIFF REVENUE.

It is simply an absurdity to talk now about a free-trade tariff, and to talk about a protective tariff; unnecessary, because the wit of man could not possibly frame a tariff that would produce \$140,000,000 in gold without amply protecting our domestic industry.

What a consolation it must be to our Republican friends to know that in framing a tariff for over \$300,000,000 a year they could not strip themselves of that protection which they so sincerely love.

Mr. ALDRICH. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. KEAN in the chair). Does the Senator from Virginia yield to the Senator from Rhode Island?

Mr. DANIEL. I yield to an interruption.

Mr. ALDRICH. What was the date of that statement?

Mr. DANIEL. Eighteen hundred and sixty-seven. It was a general truth.

Mr. ALDRICH. He changed his mind afterwards.

Mr. DANIEL. I have known gentlemen who did that every day. I do not think, however, that a change of mind is by any means a reproach to anyone if it be honest. If one discovers he is in error about anything, he should always change his mind. The time when a man gets so old that he can not change his mind the good Lord removes him to another world. [Laughter.]

I have not changed my mind on what I have said. I am trying to apply it to conditions which I took no part in creating and would deal with in the best practicable way. I have not said anything inconsistent that I know of, but I do not consider that I am a bit different from other men in desiring to vote for the things that the conditions and environments require.

JAMES A. GARFIELD ON A COMPETITIVE TARIFF AND EXTREME MEN.

Now let us hear from Hon. James A. Garfield. He was one of the most learned men that ever occupied the presidential chair. He wrote essays that will rank with some of the finest British essays. He was also a business man, who was at the head of the Ways and Means Committee of the House of Representatives. Here is what he said about the extreme men. We have them on both sides. They are just the same now as they were then:

We have seen that one extreme school of economists would place the price of all manufactured articles in the hands of foreign producers by rendering it impossible for our manufacturers to compete with them, while the other extreme school, by making it impossible for the for-

eigner to sell his competing wares in our market, would give the people no immediate check upon the prices which our manufacturers might fix for their products. I disagree with both these extremes.

I hold—

And here is the doctrine that he taught the people who ere long made him their President:

I hold that a properly adjusted competition between home and foreign products is the best gauge by which to regulate international trade. Duties should be so high that our manufacturers can fairly compete with the foreign products, but not so high as to enable them to drive out the foreign article, enjoy a monopoly of the trade, and regulate the prices as they please. This is my doctrine of protection. If Congress pursues this line of policy steadily, we shall year by year approach more nearly to the basis of free trade, because we shall be more nearly able to compete with other nations on equal terms. I am for a protection which leads to ultimate free trade.

This is philosophic. It is close to Democratic teaching; it is practicable; it looks forward, and not back; it looks up, and not down; and it lends a hand. It keeps the stream of revenue running into the Treasury and preserves the tariff for revenue, which is Democratic. It quickens competition, the life of trade, and it abjures monopoly. Again Democratic. Were this doctrine pursued, it would lead the nations to break the hard and fast congestion of tariffs and trusts.

There are some things on the free list, others that I hope and believe will go there; but the free list is often for protection, as well as very high tax rates are. Else why do Republicans favor many raw materials on the free list, such as iron and coal?

Some things you are bound to protect because they have hold of you and you can not let them go. They are tongued and grooved with so many affinities in trade, they are interlarded with so many other affairs that include both direct and collateral interests which only time can remove, that a patriot who did not think more of them than of himself is not in the right mind or mood to deal justly with the intricacies of this subject. But it is not necessary, neither does it tend to freer or fairer trade, for protection to go so high up in the air as so many of these schedules of duty do, piling Ossa upon Pelion.

It is pleasing to consider, Mr. President, that however much we tie the hands of man in one generation, nature is always relaxing the bonds, and even after the severest conflict, so sweet are the charms of peace that war becomes the guardian of peace in its right relations, and produces peace even though its processes are those of destruction.

Any man who gets wedded to any set of theories will sometimes let them run off with him. We become partisan not from the levity of our opinions, but from the sincerity and depth of them; and when we collide with men who are wholly opposed to us we see the best that is in each man brought out by the fierce contention. But when we legislate for a great Nation like this we should not forget the multitude of differences that this country has, which come to head at this place. We have all kinds of climate; we have all kinds of productions; we have all kinds of people. The old Americans, wherever you find them, are very homogeneous. Though they may differ crosswise, they can perfectly understand each other; and if there is any basis of friendship they will quickly find it. But we are too rapidly and inconsiderately introducing all manner of men into this country—many excellent, some indifferent, some bad—and we have got to act, if we represent the country in its wholeness, with regard to all the conditions which we have to contend with.

There is much good now in the Democratic party—a deficiency of numbers occasionally, some jostlings and inconveniences in lining up occasionally; but the heart of the old Democratic party has a great deal of honest and noble human nature in it. It has got one thing about it which will command the respect of those who least agree with it. It has got a spirit that does not take to dying; that never dies unless it dies hard, and if it does die, leaps up into being out of the natural instinct and love of freedom and liberality of the American Nation, and quickly puts on the robes of resurrection. I have seen it time and again infinitely worse off than it is now, and yet I have seen in this Chamber a spectacle which every one of you, no matter how northern you are, no matter how Republican you are, ought to be as proud of as I am.

I have seen more Senators in this Chamber who were ex-Confederates sitting at one time in this body than could have sat in the confederate senate. No star on our flag lost a bit of its luster; there was no man here who did not trust them as readily and as fully as if he had slept in the same house with them, with each of them, for the last forty years. He knew the stuff that they were made of; he knew that they did not speak with deceitful speech; and if he did not concur in what he regarded as their aberrations, he knew also that there was a reason for their being, and in their own hearts at least a justification of their record. Not one of them ever was ashamed of

it. If you want to find where men meet men with equal appreciation, see an old Confederate when he goes to a Grand Army reception and looks to-day in the faces of men who felt it the first duty of their lives to slay him, and he will nowhere else on earth receive a more respectful or more cordial welcome or a more thorough testimonial of American brotherhood, amity, and regard.

Such is life as we live it, and if I could order this tariff—which I know I can not—I would urge all parties to get together. If you would lock them up like a jury until they agreed the outcome would be such a fair tariff and such a concessive tariff that the average common-sense American man would indorse it, and say, "Under all circumstances, that is right."

WEBSTER—"AGRICULTURE, COMMERCE, AND MANUFACTURES."

Mr. President, let me reach beyond Garfield and Allison and Sherman, and quote you something from a man who is generally recognized as of colossal intellect and of clear perceptions. I turn to Webster. He had his changes of opinion—no man can live in a moving scene such as we live in in this world, and not modify or change his opinion—but his mind was certainly in a clear and philosophic state when he said this:

Sir, that is the true American policy which shall most fully employ American capital and labor and best sustain the whole population. With me it is a fundamental axiom; it is interwoven with my opinions; the greatest interests of the country are united and inseparable: agriculture, commerce, and manufacturing will prosper together or languish together; and that all legislation is dangerous which proposes to benefit one of these without looking to consequences which may fall on the others.

"Agriculture, commerce, and manufactures"—this was the noble trinity of industry for which Webster spoke.

"The whole population"—it was for that that Webster aimed to serve.

FAIRNESS AND JUSTICE.

Mr. President, I come from a people who have been largely engaged in pastoral things for the greatest part of the history of this country. They have not had many factories, as New England has had; but they have factories to-day, and they are advancing on the inevitable line of modern progress. What is my duty as a Democrat and as a United States Senator? I think I should be thoroughly fair and just to them and vote for nothing that is well for them that I would not vote as readily for if it benefited Oklahoma or California or Massachusetts or New Hampshire. That is my idea. I will live up to that as closely as I may; and I will ask no man to vote for anything because I think it will be a benefit to my State unless, interchangeably, I would do the same with him. If I do not preserve this equanimity and justness of opinion, I shall lose my balance.

There are many temptations about this bill; there are many beguilements in it; but if we set our compass right we stand a better chance of reaching the haven we have sought than otherwise. I believe it would be a great benefit to this country if we could have at this time a generally low, diffusive, and Democratic tariff, with "revenue" as the watchword. I do not think it possible that we can get such a tariff now. That impossibility is self-evident. The Republican party are against it. They have now the majority, derived from the people; they ought to control, and they will. But there is something more than that. You can not destroy at once by waving a wand of any kind of doctrine, good or bad in itself, an order of things that is pervasive, that is everywhere, that is the fruit of years of constructiveness of thought, and that has interlaced itself in the general affairs of men.

"There is nothing," said Sir Isaac Newton, "that you can not answer but a fact. That is a fact; if you do not answer it, it will attend you." So, appreciating these conditions, I think it is the duty of each one of us to adjust himself to them for now and for as long as their controlling and rightful situations require. "Now" is pretty much all we have got in this world to deal with anyway. The past is gone. Nobody can change anything whatever about it. The future is almost as misty as the past. We can only live for duties in sight of reasonable contemplation to-day; we can only legislate for the "now;" but if we deal wisely for to-day, the future will lead us gently on in the kindly light that Heaven sends to guide us.

The tariff of 1846, although confessedly and professedly a tariff for revenue, was, so far as regards all the great interests of the country, as perfect a tariff as any we have ever had.

WILLIAM B. ALLISON'S VIEWS OF A DEMOCRATIC TARIFF.

Now, let me read something from William B. Allison. We have had no colleague in this body who was more liked and honored than William B. Allison. He was a broad man; he was a profound man; he was an unobtrusive and a fair man.

Mr. ALDRICH. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Virginia yield to the Senator from Rhode Island?

Mr. DANIEL. With pleasure.

Mr. ALDRICH. Will the Senator give us the date of that speech?

Mr. DANIEL. It was in 1870. I will have it looked up.

Mr. ALDRICH. The Senator from Virginia must be aware, for he was probably present, that Mr. Allison on many occasions stated that at that time he occupied an entirely different position and had entirely different opinions upon the tariff than he had during the latter part of his life.

Mr. DANIEL. It did not prevent him from stating the truth as he saw it. The tariff of 1846 was the same tariff that it was when he spoke. He told history. His words were well weighed; and whether or not he changed his opinions, there they are. I prefer this edition of Mr. Allison to the one which I have not seen, to which the Senator from Rhode Island refers.

If any interest was depressed under the tariff of 1846, it was the iron interest. I do not believe that this interest, as compared with other interests, had sufficient advantage under that tariff—

This is a criticism; but behold the steel trust, and hear Mr. Carnegie, and read this bill now.

GROWTH OF THE COUNTRY UNDER THE WALKER TARIFF.

Hear Mr. Allison qualify his criticism and describe the growth of the country under the Walker Democratic tariff bill—a golden age.

Yet—

Says Mr. Allison—

Yet when we compare the growth of the country from 1840 to 1850 with the growth of the country from 1850 to 1860—the latter decade being entirely under the tariff of 1846, or the amended and greatly reduced tariff of 1857—we find that the increase in our wealth between 1850 and 1860 was equivalent to 126 per cent, while it was only 64 per cent between 1840 and 1850, four years of which decade were under the tariff of 1842, known as a "high protective tariff," but the average rate of which was about 70 per cent below the existing rate, or 27 per cent under the tariff of 1842 as against 44 per cent upon all importations under the present tariff. Our industries were generally prosperous in 1860, with the exception, possibly, of the iron interest. This was the statement of Mr. Morrill, of Vermont, on this floor during the discussion of the tariff of 1864. With regard to the condition of the steel industry in 1860, the steel manufacturers in 1866, memorializing Congress for increase of duties on steel, stated that—

"It was reserved for Pittsburg to bring about the first substantial and enduring success in the year of 1860; and encouraged by our example numerous establishments have sprung into existence, as already indicated in this paper."

And here, Mr. President, is an important fact Mr. Allison adds. I commend it to consideration:

This shows that under the revenue tariff of 1857, which imposed only an ad valorem duty of 12 per cent on steel, a substantial success was achieved in the steel manufacture in 1860.

AGGREGATES OF DOLLARS AND BATTLE SHIPS NOT STANDARDS.

There is nothing, Mr. President, in Democratic history that can discourage anyone who is looking for a wise tariff from believing that under lower tariffs this country will not prosper. A nation can not make its standard of prosperity the number of dollars that it owns; nothing is more fleeting. See the vanished surplus. A nation can not make as its standard of prosperity and well-being the number of battle ships that she puts upon the waves.

We had no battle ships when James Monroe, with Adams, of Massachusetts, sitting by his side, taught all the world a lesson and warned the autocrats of the European alliance to keep their hands off the South American Republics, which became free under the patronage of the United States of America. It is the plucky people, who know how to maintain their own rights, that teach all nations the lessons worthy to be learned.

It may be that if you had had the tariff of 1846 or its Democratic likeness in vogue all through these times you would not have had such mountainous prosperity in some places as you now possess. It may be you would not have received annually at our ports millions upon millions of heterogeneous strangers, many of them without our language, many of them knowing nothing of our laws, many of them indigestible elements in the American Commonwealth. It may be you would not have had as many millionaires spending their declining years in apprehension that they will or will not die poor; but you would have had a more homogeneous population; you would have had more independent men living upon their own land and imbued with the American principles which made this country free; you would not have had such great cities as you have now with such stranded populations.

The gloomiest thing that a man can behold in all this earth is one of the great cities, with its squalid degradation crowding around the palaces. A man who wants to get a wholesome sight of life, to get the aroma of fresh air, to breathe amongst

the trees, to raise his children as worthy and virtuous American citizens proud of their country, has to go away from the city and out into the more sparsely settled portions of the country, where the sun shines and where every man and woman has opportunity to educate their children in the way they should go.

The fountain of patriotism is the home. When the people live in pigeon boxes, crowded story upon story above them, nameless to the looker-on, without whereon to lay their heads, except in some place that they would like to escape from, that nation is either going too fast or is overlooking the safe, plain ways of life.

If we continue to build up men and great congested cities in disproportionate wealth; if we frame our laws so as to make richer those who have already become rich and to keep poor those who are poor, we will overlook the fundamental conditions of stable, permanent, enduring, and grand prosperity.

But, Mr. President, let me hasten on with these generalizations. The estimated revenues under this tariff bill and the percentages have just this morning been laid upon our tables. None of us have had a half hour to read them. I have not gone into the discussion of schedules; neither did the distinguished Senator who presides over the Committee on Finance. In conclusion, in this tariff bill I would ask that you stay with the land and stay with the people who make their homes upon the land. Do not turn the batteries of your powerful laws against the man who makes his fortune or is content with a scanty living by sending the plow through the furrow and taking as his reward the plants that grow out of the land of his home.

There is one such plant in my State. It is "the ugly duckling" of every farmyard, and there is no bird of any feather that does not seek to pull a feather out of it. It is tobacco. Go to Turkey. The Sultan will have none of it. No matter how much his people want it, not an ounce is permitted to go there. Go to England. Seventy-six cents a pound must be laid down before an Englishman will touch it. Then he makes a fortune in manufacturing it. Our New England friends have taken care of Connecticut and Connecticut Valley tobacco. I do not blame them. Get our tobacco ready to be sold. What do you say to the farmer? "You shall not sell it to a manufacturer without paying to do so." There is not another citizen in the United States who is denied by an act of Congress the right to sell freely the thing that he made by his own hands out of the land that he owns. Put that thing in your pipe and smoke it.

A Kentucky planter, a Virginia planter, a Pennsylvania planter can not take his own tobacco, for which he asks you nothing, but which he tenders in a trade, and sell it as he pleases without first paying a tax. You talk about Kentucky Night Riders. I am a man of law. I take the side of law whenever it has an encounter. But, gentlemen, we have had the need of rebels in this country to teach law, and the lessons that they have taught this Nation have been its wisest and most enduring. I do not mean by that in the slightest degree to encourage, to approve, or to recognize the right, or the propriety of any man to take the law into his own hands. But whenever you find men in this country who manifest a desire to take the law in their hands, you should also scrutinize your own conscience and your own conduct and see to it that you did nothing to provoke it.

It is the man who produces conflict, whether by speech, whether by law, or otherwise, who is more to be blamed for conflict than anyone else.

"WOE UNTO HIM BY WHOM OFFENSE COMETH."

The farmers of this country, Mr. President, have done more for the country and have got less of favor back from the country than any other element of our population. On that statement I challenge contradiction. The favors that flow back from a liberal and a magnanimous government seldom flow over the old homestead and seldom go down to the farms. The farmer is getting rural free delivery now—a new benefaction, a wise benefaction, a thing for which he may justly thank this generous and this progressive people. But the more he gets of the intelligence of the world, the more he discerns that the world has cared less for him than it has for those who are nearer the throne and more favored.

I will be answered back that you have given empires to the farmer. True. No nation was ever more generous in that respect. I will be told that you have irrigated land which had been abandoned to the desert. True. It is justly to your credit. But observe this: You do not add to the prosperity, to the wealth, or to the bettered condition of any farmer by giving other people farms. They set up in rivalry with him. They take those farms instead of buying his. They add to the production of the things which compete with his, and while he does not oppose it, for it is the natural course of progress, you have done

nothing for the old farmer because you have got new lands and irrigated them for the new farmer.

Neither are you doing anything for American labor when the steamships are all occupied in bringing foreign laborers to our markets and shores. It is a difficult and hard thing to handle, I know, but you are not benefiting the workmen, and that is the point we have to consider. You have great factories. You have a certain number of mechanics who are employed there, and while they are employed there, here comes a new steamer with poverty-stricken people from all the regions of Europe, who are ready to work for anything, and take the jobs out of their hands. Both farmer and workman have had their attention called to these things. Do not forget them when you fashion the shape of your tariff and the legislation that will be consequent thereon, and never lower the countenance to contemplate other ideals of our country than those which the fathers have instilled in our hearts—ideals which will survive as long as their sons honor wisdom and patriotism and virtue.

I close my remarks with the words of truth of Andrew Jackson. He was an heroic man in both civic and military life. He never permitted to die out in his mind the grounded principles of our Republic. He never abandoned a friend or flinched before a foe. In his public measures he aimed always at the ends of his country, of which he regarded freedom and independence as the chief. He has been discounted by some who thought him too rough about the banks and about military discipline. No doubt he made mistakes sometimes, for all men do who make anything; but whatever mistakes he made he hewed to the line of his great endeavors, and their accomplishment left the country better that he had lived, and more united. From an orphan boy in the South and West he climbed by dint of energy and honor from one place to another until he rose to the highest place that the people could confer upon him. He never lost either his heart or his head as he pressed forward, and no one felt or knew better than he did that it is from the thoughts and daily lives, ambitions and habits of the people who earn their livelihood in their own homes that are derived the purest instincts of patriotism and the most truthful suggestions of wisdom. He was teaching what the working and achieving commonalty had taught when he said:

It is not in a splendid government, sustained by powerful monopolies and aristocratic establishments, that the people will find their rights protected and their principles secure, but in a plain government devoid of pomp, protecting all, granting favors to none, dispensing its blessings like the dew of heaven, unseen and unfelt, save in the harmony and beauty it contributes to produce.

Mr. ALDRICH. Mr. President, the distinguished Senator from Virginia [Mr. DANIEL] seems to be still troubled about the action of the majority of the committee in the management of this bill and its report, and the distinguished Senator from Texas [Mr. CULBERSON] seems to fear that the Constitution is being violated.

Mr. CULBERSON. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. KEAN in the chair). Does the Senator from Rhode Island yield to the Senator from Texas?

Mr. ALDRICH. Certainly.

Mr. CULBERSON. The Senator ought to perceive, and he will as soon as I call his attention to the fact, that the Senator from Texas was not in fear of a violation of the Constitution in that respect, but he invited the attention of the Senator to what he ought to have known before—that it is in violation of the rules of the Senate, not of the Constitution of the United States.

Mr. ALDRICH. I will send to the desk and ask to have read the discussion which took place in the Senate of the United States on the 21st day of February, 1894, and I request the special attention of those two Senators to that debate. The Senator from New Hampshire, Mr. Chandler, known to all of you, was asking the Senator from Indiana, Mr. Voorhees, who was chairman of the Committee on Finance at that time, about the conduct of the committee and what the committee were doing in the preparation of the tariff bill, and the answers of Mr. Voorhees and Mr. Vest and the observations of Senator Sherman are extremely interesting in view of present conditions. I ask that they may be read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the Secretary will read as requested.

The Secretary read as follows:

[From the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, February 21, 1894.]

Mr. CHANDLER. * * * I am asking the Senator from Indiana whether the acting member of that committee to-day and now is the Senator from Texas or the Senator from New Jersey, or whether both of those Senators are acting? Is not that a fair inquiry to make?

Mr. VOORHEES. Mr. President, I have no disposition to give the Senator from New Hampshire a short answer, as he knows personally; but we are doing our business in our own way, which is none of his business. He is not a member of that committee, nor charged with any of

the duties connected with it. We are hard at work transacting the business entrusted to our hands to the best of our ability. If the Senator is not satisfied with that answer, he may introduce a resolution of inquiry as to what we are doing, who is doing it, and how it is being done; and then we shall investigate it. That is all the answer I have to make to the Senator.

Mr. CHANDLER. I beg leave to say to the Senator from Indiana that it is my business to know what the committee is doing.

Mr. VOORHEES. Mr. President, I am not to be betrayed into a loss of temper. I have nothing but feelings of personal kindness toward the Senator from New Hampshire, and I told him in tones of courtesy, I thought, that the RECORD showed who constitute the committee. I ventured to say that we were doing our work in our own way, that it was our business and not the Senator's business, and that if he wanted a further answer, aside from what the RECORD shows as to who are on the committee, he could introduce a resolution and investigate. We can stand investigation right well, strange as that may seem.

Mr. MANDERSON. Rumor has it, the newspapers say, that the bill has been referred to a committee of five, three of the majority and two of the minority party on the committee. Their names have been published in the newspapers, but not in the RECORD, and I think we ought to know.

Mr. SHERMAN. It is said that, in pursuance of a custom which has sprung up within the last few years—or at least it has been said to me—the bill should be referred, in the first instance, to a subcommittee of the Committee on Finance favoring the bill as sent to us from the House of Representatives. I believe that rule or that custom is being pursued now by our Democratic friends. Certain it is that no member of the Committee on Finance who is classed as a Republican has been called into consultation with respect to the action upon the bill. I do not know but, upon the whole, that is probably the best way to consider the question.

Mr. VEST. There has never been any subcommittee on the tariff upon the Democratic side of the Finance Committee, and such a statement has grown out of the active and prolific imagination which characterizes the modern newspaper reporter.

Mr. BUTLER. There are but six Democratic votes in the committee. Mr. VEST. As a matter of course there are only six Democratic votes in the committee, and there can be but six. It should not make any difference to our distinguished friends on the other side of the Chamber whether the work on the tariff bill be done by three or five or six of us. Without using the words of the Senator from Indiana [Mr. Voorhees], I submit in the kindest and most parliamentary sense that we can hardly be any of their business affecting the direct result in this case. The work that we have done has been done by those of us who are willing and able to do it, not under any appointment, but because we appreciate the great public necessity which requires that the bill shall be reported to the Senate as soon as possible.

There has been no star-chamber about it. We have had no public hearings, because we deliberately resolved not to have them. We have listened, as far as we could, to the extent of human ability and endurance, to all who have come to us; and what a task it has been will be known only to those who have been afflicted in that regard. This is a small matter, Mr. President. When we bring the bill before the Senate there will be time enough for the eloquence and logic which have been so unsparingly used here to-day. As to the modus operandi, so long as we do not violate the rules of the Senate or the laws or the Constitution, I respectfully submit that we ought to be permitted to do this work in our own fashion, submitting it, of course, afterwards to the full Finance Committee, and then reporting it to the Senate for their action upon it.

Mr. VOORHEES. Now, so far as the question of a subcommittee is concerned, I think it matters nothing to Senators on either side of the Chamber whether the bill is considered by a subcommittee technically or by men who have been named as a subcommittee. The fact is that a majority of a committee which is charged with framing a bill must necessarily, before it is considered by the full committee, put their case in shape on paper. Every Senator on the other side of the Chamber knows what I say to be true. Every Senator there knows when they had the majority and brought forward the tariff measure of 1883, and notably of 1890—the McKinley bill—for weeks (I am tempted to say months, for it was a long time) none of the minority of the committee, then belonging to this side of the chamber, was in consultation with them. We abided our time. We knew it was their right to make their bill to suit themselves before they submitted it to us or to the country.

Mr. VOORHEES. I repeat, Mr. President, the only logical and reasonable and proper method of legislation on a subject of this kind is for the party in the majority, who are responsible for legislation, to put it in such shape as many be satisfactory to them, and then put it before the Senate and the country and take the consequences. Private discussion, prolonged and protracted debate between man and man, between eleven people—six on one side predetermined, five on the other—is simply a ruthless consumption of time, while the interests of the country are demanding speed, rapidity of action. Those who plead for delay, for long hearings, for technicalities, for Finance Committee discussions between man and man, will be known before the country as the advocates of delay in an hour when it is important to the business interests to know what is to happen to them.

Mr. ALDRICH. I can add nothing to the words which have just been read on this subject.

Mr. President, I ask what is the present status of the bill?

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The bill has been referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. ALDRICH. I report back the reengrossed copy of the bill with amendments.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Senator from Rhode Island reports from the Committee on Finance, with amendments, a bill, the title of which will be read.

The SECRETARY. A bill (H. R. 1438) to provide revenue, equalize duties, and encourage the industries of the United States, and for other purposes.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The bill will go to the calendar.

Mr. ALDRICH. I ask that it be made the unfinished business.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Senator from Rhode Island asks that the bill the title of which has just been read be made the unfinished business. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

EXECUTIVE SESSION.

Mr. KEAN. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to, and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business. After thirteen minutes spent in executive session the doors were reopened, and (at 3 o'clock and 18 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, April 20, 1909, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS.

Executive nominations received by the Senate April 19, 1909.

COLLECTOR OF CUSTOMS.

George W. Huntley, of Ohio, to be collector of customs for the district of Miami, in the State of Ohio, in place of Joseph C. Bonner, whose term of service expired by limitation March 6, 1909.

ENVOY EXTRAORDINARY AND MINISTER PLENIPOTENTIARY.

Thomas C. Dawson, of Iowa, now envoy extraordinary and minister plenipotentiary to Colombia, to be envoy extraordinary and minister plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Chile, vice John Hicks.

PROMOTIONS IN THE ARMY.

INFANTRY ARM.

First Lieut. Albert R. Dillingham, Eighteenth Infantry, to be captain from April 5, 1909, vice Frier, Twenty-third Infantry, promoted.

First Lieut. William R. Gibson, Third Infantry, to be captain from April 13, 1909, vice Fealy, Second Infantry, retired from active service.

PROMOTIONS IN THE NAVY.

Lieut. Commander Joseph W. Oman to be a commander in the navy from the 11th day of March, 1909, vice Commander Richard T. Mulligan, promoted.

The following-named ensigns to be lieutenants (junior grade) in the navy from the 2d day of February, 1909, upon the completion of three years' service in present grade:

Paul E. Dampman,
Edson C. Oak,
Arthur H. Rice,
Clarence A. Richards, and
David W. Bagley.

The following-named lieutenants (junior grade) to be lieutenants in the navy from the 2d day of February, 1909, to fill vacancies existing in that grade on that date:

Paul E. Dampman,
Edson C. Oak,
Arthur H. Rice,
Clarence A. Richards, and
David W. Bagley.

Midshipman Roy Le C. Stover to be an ensign in the navy from the 13th day of September, 1908, to fill a vacancy existing in that grade on that date.

The following-named citizens to be assistant surgeons in the navy from the 14th day of April, 1908, to fill vacancies existing in that grade on that date:

John G. Ziegler, a citizen of Pennsylvania;
Glenmore F. Clark, a citizen of Kentucky;
William M. Kerr, a citizen of New York;
George A. Riker, a citizen of New York; and
Tharos Harlan, a citizen of the District of Columbia.

CONFIRMATIONS.

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate April 19, 1909.

PROMOTION IN THE REVENUE-CUTTER SERVICE.

Cadet Engineer William Hyde Doron to be a third lieutenant of engineers in the Revenue-Cutter Service.

ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF THE TREASURY.

Charles D. Hilles to be Assistant Secretary of the Treasury.

ASSOCIATE JUSTICE OF THE SUPREME COURT OF NEW MEXICO.
Ira A. Abbott to be associate justice of the supreme court of New Mexico.

UNITED STATES ATTORNEY.

Aloysius I. McCormick to be United States attorney for the southern district of California.

PROMOTIONS IN THE ARMY.

CAVALRY ARM.

Capt. George W. Goode to be major.
First Lieut. Douglas McCaskey to be captain.

INFANTRY ARM.

Maj. Arthur C. Ducat to be lieutenant-colonel.
Capt. James H. Frier to be major.
Capt. Armand I. Lasseigne to be major.
First Lieut. Wait C. Johnson to be captain.
First Lieut. J. Millard Little to be captain.
First Lieut. John L. Bond to be captain.
First Lieut. Josephus S. Cecil to be captain.
First Lieut. Edward R. Stone to be captain.
Second Lieut. Horatio K. Bradford to be first lieutenant.
Second Lieut. Charles H. Mason to be first lieutenant.
Second Lieut. Nicholas W. Campanole to be first lieutenant.
Second Lieut. John G. Maccomb to be first lieutenant.
Second Lieut. L. Worthington Moseley to be first lieutenant.

COAST ARTILLERY CORPS.

Lieut. Col. John V. White to be colonel.
Maj. John C. W. Brooks to be lieutenant-colonel.
Capt. William R. Smith to be major.
First Lieut. Arthur H. Bryant to be captain.
Second Lieut. James H. Cunningham to be first lieutenant.

APPOINTMENTS IN THE ARMY.

COAST ARTILLERY CORPS.

To be second lieutenants.

Carl Amos Lohr,
Laurence Tidd Walker,
Samuel Harrison Tilghman,
Otto Harry Schrader,
William James Turkenton,
Creedy Collins Sheppard,
Howard T. Clark,
Halstead Powell Councilman,
Arthur Haldane Doig,
Robert Elton Guthrie,
George Elmer Nikirk,
William Robert Nichols,
Paul Henry Herman,
Oscar Czar Warner,
Frank Sheldon Clark,
Kelley Benjamin Lemmon,
William Skinner Fulton,
Thomas Ogden Humphreys,
Edwin Francis Barlow,
Donald MacQueen Ashbridge,
Hollis Le Roy Muller, and
Eli Elmer Bennett.

PROMOTIONS IN THE NAVY.

Lieut. Commander Webster A. Edgar to be a commander.
The following-named ensigns to be lieutenants (junior grade):
Halsey Powell,
Abram Claude,
Nathan W. Post,
Harry A. Stuart,
William F. Halsey, jr.,
James W. Hayward,
George M. Baum, and
Joseph D. Little.

The following-named lieutenants (junior grade) to be lieutenants:

Halsey Powell,
Abram Claude,
Nathan W. Post,
Harry A. Stuart,
William F. Halsey, jr., and
James W. Hayward.
Asst. Paymaster Franklin P. Williams to be a passed assistant paymaster.

POSTMASTERS.

COLORADO.

William F. Ordway, at Dolores, Colo.
Nellie R. Summers, at Gunnison, Colo.

FLORIDA.

Homer B. Rainey, at Wauchula, Fla.

IDAHO.

Alson H. Nihart, at Buhl, Idaho.

ILLINOIS.

Claude L. Stone, at Mason City, Ill.

LOUISIANA.

Margarette L. Tatum, at Gibsland, La.

MICHIGAN.

Ora P. Gordon, at Hopkins, Mich.

MINNESOTA.

James A. Gillespie, at Carlton, Minn.

MISSOURI.

Andrew S. Munro, at Cuba, Mo.

MONTANA.

George A. Tusler, at Terry, Mont.

NEBRASKA.

Lou W. Frazier, at Fairmont, Nebr.

NEW JERSEY.

Elbert Bradshaw, at Greenwich, N. J.
William H. Kuhlthau, at Milltown, N. J.

NEW MEXICO.

Leroy P. Loomis, at Texico, N. Mex.

OHIO.

Charles M. Trace, at New Concord, Ohio.

PENNSYLVANIA.

Martin B. Allen, at Honesdale, Pa.
William F. Eckbert, jr., at Lewistown, Pa.
Sallie P. Gillingham, at Langhorne, Pa.
John C. Tullock, at Moores, Pa.

SOUTH DAKOTA.

Charles N. Curtiss, at Wessington, S. Dak.
Theophilus N. Kirkpatrick, at Letcher, S. Dak.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

MONDAY, April 19, 1909.

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. Henry N. Couden, D. D.

The Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, April 15, 1909, was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Crockett, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed the following resolution:

Resolved, That the Secretary be directed to return to the House of Representatives, in compliance with its request, the bill (H. R. 1435) to provide revenue, equalize duties, and encourage the industries of the United States, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate had insisted upon its amendments to the bill (H. R. 1033) to provide for the Thirteenth and subsequent decennial censuses, disagreed to by the House of Representatives, had agreed to the conference asked by the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and had appointed Mr. LA FOLLETTE, Mr. HALE, and Mr. BAILEY as the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed without amendment joint resolutions of the following titles:

H. J. Res. 45. Joint resolution making appropriations for the payment of certain expenses incident to the first session of the Sixty-first Congress; and

H. J. Res. 38. Joint resolution repealing joint resolution to provide for the distribution by Members of the Sixtieth Congress of documents, reports, and other publications, approved March 2, 1909.

THE TARIFF ON COTTON BAGGING AND TIES.

Mr. BARTLETT of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I desire to discuss briefly the matter of the tariff on cotton bagging and ties. At the present rate of duty upon these articles the tariff tax upon the cotton farmer amounts to about 10 cents per bale for bagging and ties.

The western farmer who uses binding twine has no tariff tax to pay upon that article, but it is admitted free; and not only is the binding twine admitted free, but the grasses and other material from which it is made are admitted free.

The provisions of the law relating to "drawbacks" have been so construed as to permit the exporters of products in imported

bags or bags made from imported material to receive the drawback. But this is not all of the discrimination against the cotton farmer. Upon investigation I find that the Treasury Department has for years been paying to the exporters of cotton baled in round bales the duties paid on the bagging imported for the purpose of baling cotton in round bales; but no such rule is applied to cotton exported in square bales. The baling of cotton into round bales is in the hands of a combination or trust, and up to this time the southern cotton producers have been able to prevent their control of the ginning and baling of the cotton crop. Only about 200,000 bales of cotton were in round bales last year, whereas over 13,000,000 were packed in square bales.

As illustrating this condition, I call attention to the following correspondence:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, April 14, 1909.

The SECRETARY OF THE TREASURY,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Will you kindly have furnished me the following information on the subject of bagging, commonly known as "cotton bagging," which is made from jute and imported into the United States, and used for baling cotton, a description of which will be found in paragraph 344 of the Dingley tariff law, and upon which an import duty is laid:

Whether or not under the present law bagging for cotton and fabrics of this kind suitable for covering cotton is subject to the drawback provisions of the law?

Whether drawbacks have been permitted on bagging imported under this section and used for baling cotton, where the cotton thus baled has been exported, and, if so, whether the drawback has been allowed to those who use imported bagging to cover round or square bales of cotton?

In other words, I desire to know whether—if a drawback has been allowed in this particular—it has been allowed to those who exported round or square bales of cotton, and also the amount of such drawbacks that have been paid by the United States, and to whom paid.

Also, what is the amount of revenue received by the Government during 1908 from duties collected on bagging for cotton, gunny cloth, and similar fabrics suitable for covering cotton, as provided for in the section of the Dingley law referred to above.

If the department has rendered any decisions on the subject of granting drawbacks to those who export cotton covered with imported bagging and put up in round bales, I would be glad to have a copy of such decisions or to know where I can find them.

Your early attention will greatly oblige me.

Very truly, yours,

C. L. BARTLETT.

TREASURY DEPARTMENT,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
Washington, April 16, 1909.

Hon. C. L. BARTLETT,
House of Representatives.

SIR: In reply to your letter of the 14th instant, I have the honor to advise you that during the fiscal year ended June 30, 1908, 16,349,696 square yards of bagging for cotton, gunny cloth, and similar fabrics suitable for covering cotton were imported valued at \$1,076,351.81, and dutiable at \$99,098.16. There was paid during the same year as drawback at the port of New York \$88.62 on the exportation of articles manufactured from 14,953 square yards of this imported bagging. This data is compiled by the Bureau of Statistics, Department of Commerce and Labor, and the articles exported are not specifically designated, but it is presumed that they comprise coverings for cotton bales.

There was also imported during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1908, 311,463,391.25 pounds of burlaps, valued at \$23,187,861, on which duty was collected amounting to \$5,841,535.93. Four hundred and thirty thousand three hundred and eighty-seven dollars and forty-six cents of this duty was refunded as drawback on the exportation of bags manufactured from the imported burlaps. It is probable that the round bale bags may be included in the bags on which this drawback was paid. I am therefore unable to advise you accurately the amount of drawback paid on the exportation of round bale bags.

On March 1, 1904, Treasury Decision 25076, the Department provided for the allowance of drawback on round bale bags manufactured by the American Cotton Company, of New York, from imported burlaps. This decision was extended on January 2, 1907, Treasury Decision 27809, to cover similar bags manufactured by Reagan Round Bale Company, of Houston, Tex., and on December 28, 1907, Treasury Decision 28646, it was further extended to cover round bale bags manufactured by the Alabama-Mississippi Round Bale Company, of Montgomery, Ala.

On January 28, 1903, Treasury Decision 24192, the Department established regulations for the allowance of drawback on round bale bags manufactured by Bemis Brothers Bag Company, of St. Louis, Mo., wholly from imported burlaps, said bags being sewed on one side, and having at each end a hem containing a shirring string. These decisions may be found in the bound volume of the Treasury Decisions. No drawback has been allowed on covering for square bales.

Respectfully,

J. B. REYNOLDS,
Assistant Secretary.

The following statement was made before the Ways and Means Committee, and will be found on page 2840 of the hearings, of date November 30:

STATEMENT OF MR. C. LEE McMILLAN, OF NEW ORLEANS, LA.

MR. McMILLAN. I have been sent here by the New Orleans Cotton Exchange to ask this committee to place upon the free list jute bagging used for the covering of cotton. We think that it is entitled to be so placed. At present the duty paid amounts to a very small matter to the Government, and the farmer of the South we consider is entitled to have the privilege of wrapping his cotton free, just the same as the farmer of the West gets his binder twine free. For fourteen years binder twine has remained upon the free list, and during those fourteen years there has been this tax on cotton bagging. The tax on cotton bagging is six-tenths of a cent, as you will see there, per square

yard, amounting to nearly three-quarters per running yard of 44 inches, and amounting to 4½ cents per bale on every bale of cotton grown in America.

Through the courtesy of the chairman I was informed on Friday that I might at the same time address you gentlemen in connection with cotton ties, which occupy the same position to the cotton planter as does jute bagging. Cotton ties for the past few years have not been imported at all, the duty being prohibitive. You will find that the duty is half a cent per pound, 22½ cents per bundle, amounting to 4½ cents on each bale produced in this country. We think that on cotton ties the same thing applies as to the farmer who raises wheat or anything else where binder twine is used, and that he is entitled to get his cotton ties free.

The steel mills of this country, I think, are amply able to compete with the foreigner. I have been in the rolling mills in England, and they do not compare with any of ours in this country. The improved machinery here will enable the American to still have a very fair share of the business, and perhaps only the ports like New Orleans, Savannah, or Galveston will amount to anything on the importing.

I also call attention to the following statement made by the same witness before the Ways and Means Committee, which will be found on pages 4826-4827 of the hearings:

NEW ORLEANS, December 8, 1908.

Hon. SERENO E. PAYNE,

Chairman of Committee on Ways and Means,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: In addition to my statement made before your committee on the 30th ultimo, I now ask to be allowed to submit the following in connection with the subject of jute bagging for covering cotton, which I requested you to place upon the free list.

The American makers, say, three in number, consisting of the American Manufacturing Company, of New York; the Ludlow Manufacturing Associates, of Boston; and the Peru Bagging Manufacturing Company, of Peru, Ind., own and control every mill in America now engaged in making new bagging for cotton.

The first two corporations agree at the beginning of each season upon a price to open the market at, and the small Peru company follows. An arbitrary list, showing differentials throughout the entire cotton belt, is strictly followed, and the price named any given point by the American Manufacturing Company is exactly same as the one quoted same point by the Ludlow Company.

Some years ago there were several independent mills engaged in this business, but the ones now surviving managed to drive the others entirely out by selling bagging below price at which the independents could make same at, and in the end the American Manufacturing Company bought such independent mills as the one in New Orleans, in Louisville, Ky., and in Galveston, Tex., and then dismantled same, shipped such machinery as was wanted to Brooklyn and St. Louis, and breaking up and selling for scrap the balance of the machinery. I think that the same process was followed when the American Manufacturing Company bought out their New York and Brooklyn rivals. When additional machinery has been required by the Americans, they have either had it made in this country, or they bought it secondhand in Dundee and imported same free of duty.

There can be no doubt about the profits of the above-named concerns being very large (see how they have grown), and I ask you to take into consideration the great amount of low-grade jute butts and the vast amount of secondhand jute bagging they buy and make into yarns when you compare their cost with that of the Calcutta maker, who uses a much higher quality of raw material.

I beg to call your attention to the fact that during the past eight or ten years the American Manufacturing Company, through its various agents, have imported into this country from Calcutta the major part of all of this kind of cloth made in Calcutta, and I have known seasons when they bought every yard that Calcutta mills could furnish. It is reported upon what I consider the best authority that the American Manufacturing Company, through its agents, has already secured from three of the Calcutta mills all of the bagging they can make from September, 1908, to August, 1909, and offers have been made to the remaining Calcutta mills by the American Manufacturing Company to take their output for the coming season. Portions of the above-mentioned purchase have already arrived here and same is being held by the local selling agent of the American Manufacturing Company.

The writer has never known of any combination existing among the Calcutta mills, and whenever I have cabled out there for prices no two mills ever named me the same figure upon any given date. If bagging was placed upon the free list to-day, I think the American makers would still be amply able to compete. As a matter of fact, the American Manufacturing Company turned out early this year 2-pound 45-inch bagging, at 6½ cents per yard at the ports, while all that came from Calcutta cost about 1½ cents per yard more, or, say, about 8 cents landed, duty paid.

The largest revenue I remember as being paid the Government on jute cotton bagging during any one year did not exceed \$120,000, while the cotton farmer pays about one and one-quarter million dollars annually to the bagging and steel trusts, because of the present rate of duty on the articles he requires, which occupy the same position exactly as does binder twine, which is admitted free of duty.

Respectfully submitted,

Yours, faithfully,

C. LEE McMILLAN.

MR. Speaker, under the rule adopted by the House under which the tariff bill was considered and passed, it was decided by the chairman who presided that no amendment was in order looking to placing bagging and ties on the free list. The only hope for relief is that the Senate may take the matter up and consider it. With some hope that the Senate may take up the question and give the farmers of the South the relief they are so plainly entitled to, I have addressed the following communication to the Finance Committee of the Senate:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, April 16, 1909.

Hon. NELSON W. ALDRICH,

Chairman Committee on Finance, United States Senate.

DEAR SIR: As a Representative from one of the cotton-growing States and a State that raised 2,000,000 of the 13,500,000 bales raised, I respectfully call your attention to the matter of what is called "cotton bagging" and "ties."

Cotton bagging and ties are used exclusively by the farmers of the South in baling their cotton and preparing it for market. The cotton crop, without the by-products of cotton seed and cotton-seed oil, is valued at \$850,000,000. Sixty-five per cent of the raw cotton raised by the South is exported and brings into the United States from abroad over \$400,000,000 annually.

Under the Dingley tariff law and under the pending tariff bill a duty is imposed upon these articles, which, in the case of cotton ties, is almost prohibitory, being, under the present law, five-tenths of 1 cent per pound, which the pending bill reduces to two-tenths of a cent per pound. But, owing to the fact that the manufacture of cotton ties in this country is in the hands of a few corporations, the proposed reduction would be of little benefit. Under the present law and under the pending bill the duty on cotton bagging is fixed at six-tenths of a cent per pound.

In baling the cotton crop there are used 80,000,000 ties, which weigh about 4 pounds each, and 93,000,000 yards of bagging, weighing about 1 pound to the yard, and the duty on bagging and ties amounts to about 10 cents per bale.

The present law and the proposed law admit free of duty binding twine used by the farmers of the West in binding their wheat and other crops. It also admits free of duty the grasses from which binding twine is made, and even jute and jute butts, out of which cotton bagging is made, is admitted free for binding twine. Besides, bagging made out of burlaps and other material in which wheat is exported is subject to the drawback provisions of the tariff law.

I therefore urge upon you and your honorable committee the consideration of the question of placing hoop or band iron or steel used for baling cotton, as contained in paragraph 123 of the pending bill, and bagging for cotton, etc., as contained in paragraph 350 of the bill, on the free list. In the event you can not do this much in the interest of the producers of this great staple, which, in a great measure, clothes the world, I respectfully urge that you so frame the bill as to extend the drawback provisions of the law to the bagging and ties used on exported cotton. I am informed by the Secretary of the Treasury that certain exporters of what is known as "round-bale cotton" are entitled to the benefits of the drawback provisions of the tariff law; but the vast number of bales of cotton exported is packed in square bales, and the exporters of cotton packed in square bales are not allowed the benefits of the drawback provisions.

I inclose, as a mere suggestion, an amendment to the bill in this regard which would be of great benefit to the cotton producers, and would give them at least 65 per cent of their bagging and ties free of duty.

On this subject I beg to call your attention to the testimony before the Ways and Means Committee contained in the Tariff Hearings on Schedule J, pages 4933-4941, being the testimony of Mr. McMillan on the subject. I also call your attention to a letter from Mr. McMillan on the same subject, on pages 4950-4953.

In 1907 the duty collected on imported bagging amounted to about \$118,000, and the duty collected on imported ties amounted to \$85.

Asking that this matter be given the consideration its importance merits, I am,

Very respectfully,

C. L. BARTLETT.

Mr. STANLEY. Mr. Speaker, our Democratic "daddies" started out with the Constitution as a handbook. Jefferson Davis spent two years on his brother's plantation studying constitutional law and in kindred reading before entering public life.

The timely warning of an able historian and philosopher to his own generation might well apply to this:

Do we not show too great a disposition to be governed by considerations of the present with too little regard to the past and the future? It may be safely asserted that the statesman who, in shaping his political theories, shall disregard the landmarks offered by the past will never prove a safe counselor for the state.

Conditions change; principles never do. For instance, nations, like individuals, are at different times addicted to different vices, but we do not hunt for a new decalogue to fit the case of the fellow who is guilty of some original brand of devilment.

The Democracy of Jefferson is a complete system, and was once a kind of political decalogue. Statesmen attempted to understand and expound it; new conditions made it necessary to put special emphasis upon one and then another fundamental principle of government as enunciated by the sage of Monticello.

Democracy should never, like Paul's Athenian mob, go hunting for some new thing which will do to catch votes at the next election.

There never was a better time to stop and think. A time-tried, old-fashioned Democratic platform—Jeffersonian Democracy without the trimmings—will carry the next House and the Presidency in 1912.

The fundamental conditions which made Democracy dominant for sixty years after the inauguration of Thomas Jefferson exist now, and they, strange as it may seem, exist now, to a degree just as they did then, for the first time in half a century.

The old Federalists were essentially the party of caste and special privilege, always considering the people good things to exploit and to fool. Pretty good standpatters they were.

In the language of their admirer and historian, Von Holst:

The Republicans (Democrats) were far inferior to the Federalists in the number and the ability of their leaders, and, moreover, the moneyed interests of the Northern States were the corner stone of the Federal party. These were two elements which might well keep them in power a while longer, even if the majority of the people were in reality more attached to the principles of their antagonists.

But they were not a support on which they could establish lasting rule. In a Democratic republic, the political influence of the moneyed interests, when they have not attained the immense influence they have in America to-day, is, as a rule, very limited, etc. (Von Holst's Constitutional History of the United States, vol. 1, p. 179.)

The overweening and all-important question of the form of the Government having been settled and Hamilton's "penchant" for nobility and a monarchy disguised as a republic having been repudiated utterly and forever, it was the natural, if not the inevitable thing, that he should write his Report on Manufacturers.

His followers were the class to be benefited by a system of special privilege and legalized plunder, and neither he nor his party had any compunction about fooling or fleecing the planters of the South and West, or making the Government fetch and carry for their benefit.

Having failed to get "Uncle Sam" to issue patents for a ready-made set of lords and ladies to take care of the people who were unable to take care of themselves, they determined by juggling with import duties and the taxing power to create an oligarchy of wealth.

If anybody thinks I am too hard on the Federalists in their latter days, let him read the proceedings of the Hartford convention.

That convention did not succeed in disrupting the Union, but it played havoc with the Federalist party, and it should have done it.

This party did not die without making its will; it left a dog-eared copy of Hamilton's Report on Manufacturers to the new Whig party.

In the days of the Federalist and the Whig there was no Mason and Dixon's line; it was the children of the fellows who turned a lucky penny in the slave trade, importing naked Africans from Dahomey and the Gulf of Guinea and selling the frightened, chattering wretches to the cotton planters of the South, and not the slave traders themselves, who in the fifties began to throw moral "conspicuous fits" about the brutality of southern slave drivers.

The Historian Ormsby, born in Vermont, a New England Whig, flays abolition and defends the holding of slaves by an appeal to history—to natural and divine law.

The one distinct, eternal, and paramount issue between the Democrats and Whigs was the question of so-called "protection" to infant industries. The fellows who from choice or necessity made a living by labor took no stock in protection; those who lived by their wits or the other fellow's labor—that is, capitalists and manufacturers and sugar planters, who saw a chance to get a "little on the side" by operation of law—found this second-hand edition of Hamilton's Report mighty interesting reading.

Says Ormsby:

These parties (Whig and Federal) have continued from their origin until a recent date, both occasionally changed as to names, adherents, leaders, and principles, and alternately in their ascendancy in the government of the country, as the Federal was in reality the parent of the Whig party. (Ormsby's History of the Whig Party, p. 46.)

In speaking of the Democratic party of that date, the author, a generous foe, is forced, in justice to truth, to pay it this deserved tribute:

They (the Democrats) were patriots, warmly devoted to the cause of human liberty, and willing to perish in the defense of their country. This party was no sectional organization, but was and ever has been intensely national. Jefferson, the founder of American Democracy, was in heart and soul a lover of freedom. The watchword of the party that formed around him was "Liberty."

There exists to-day an absolutely false and untenable impression that Democracy is local, provincial, sectional, and it springs from the confounding of two entirely different things—Democracy and the "solid South."

No historian or statesman who sees beyond his nose will conclude that the principles of Democracy were written for a southern political sect, simply because a half century after the death of Jefferson, as an inevitable result of the war, the lines of Democracy were forced for a time within the boundaries of a dozen Southern States.

The character of the men who at a given time maintain a political theory does not inevitably prove that their doctrine is not suited to the needs of other men and other sections.

The Christian religion was at one time professed only in Palestine, and preached by a handful of Jewish fishermen.

Should the Turks again overrun all Europe, except England, that would not make the Christian religion English. Southerners are generally Democratic, but Democracy is neither northern nor southern.

The tariff is a local issue only from a Republican or protectionist standpoint. Protectionism is necessarily local in its operation and limited in the number of its beneficiaries. This is the essence of special privilege, and special privilege is the genius of Republicanism. Democracy, seeking the greatest good for the greatest number, and logically the party of the consumer and of the producer in an open and unprotected market, is national; because the interests of consumers and such producers

everywhere, whether cotton planters in Alabama or growers of corn in Illinois or wheat in Dakota, are identically the same.

The old Whig leaders possessed one quality absolutely unknown to the modern standpatter—intellectual integrity. They did not dismiss every political economist, from Adam Smith down, with debonair contempt. They not only had intellectual integrity, but they had moral courage, and met the issue squarely. Clay, Calhoun, Webster, and their confrères never maintained for a second that you could force ten cotton planters to contribute into a common fund in order to help one fellow grow cane or beet sugar and then sell it to these same cotton planters at a higher price than they could buy it for under natural rather than artificial conditions, and in that way make the other nine cotton planters rich. They never maintained that you could force a man to give his money to some beneficiary or special pet of legislation and give him so much that after he got rich he would return more than he received. The old Whigs admitted that protection was a tax upon the consumer and a hardship upon the producer whose product was not enhanced in value by the tax, but they claimed that the fostering of infant industries and the necessities of war justified this interference in favor of the manufacturer on the part of the Government.

The beauty about the old tariff issue, as presented by the Whigs, was its honesty, its transparent honesty. As a result, the cotton planter in the South was no more Democratic than the farmer in the corn belt of southern Illinois or the wheat grower in Wisconsin and Iowa. Each saw at a glance that this system increased the price of the things that he had to buy and did not affect in the slightest degree the articles that he had to sell, and he was necessarily a Democrat. So candid and transparent was the issue that where the interests of a community changed, its politics changed with them. As long as Massachusetts was engaged in commerce and shipping she was antiprotection; becoming a great manufacturing State after the war of 1812, she turned Whig. Sugar made Louisiana Whig, and hemp has, to an extent, dominated the politics of Kentucky. Republican Iowa, raising corn, and Democratic Louisiana, raising sugar and rice, are political anachronisms.

A glance at the old returns from presidential elections before the war demonstrates at a glance the nationalism of the two parties. Prior to the slavery issue there was not a semblance of sectionalism. In 1844 James K. Polk carried Illinois, Indiana, Maine, Michigan, New Hampshire, New York, and Pennsylvania. Henry Clay saved Kentucky, Maryland, North Carolina, and Tennessee to the Whigs. In 1848 Lewis Cass, Democrat, carried Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Maine, Michigan, New Hampshire, Ohio, and Wisconsin, and lost to his Whig opponent Delaware, Florida, Georgia, Kentucky, Louisiana, Maryland, North Carolina, and Tennessee.

In 1856 James Buchanan carried California, Illinois, Indiana, New Jersey, and Pennsylvania. In 1856, as a result of the abolition agitation, Kentucky, Maryland, North Carolina, and Tennessee went Democratic for the first time in sixteen years; and for the first time in a generation, Illinois and New Hampshire lined up on the other side. Indiana, Illinois, Iowa, Maine, New Hampshire, Ohio, Wisconsin, Connecticut, New Jersey, New York, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, Wisconsin, and Maine, some of them part of the time and most of them all of the time, were to be found in the Democratic column. On the other hand, Kentucky, Maryland, North Carolina, Tennessee, Delaware, Florida, Georgia, and Louisiana were, during the same period, usually found in the camp of the Whigs.

The civil war did not change the opinions of people North or South upon the question of protection. They simply quit thinking about the tariff. They had more vital and absorbing interests. The old Whig map of the United States was literally inundated in that deluge of blood and carnage called "the rebellion." The northern Democrat had little patience with the institution of chattel slavery. He was passionately devoted to the Union. He regarded the man who would plan to dismember it as a traitor, and the man who would carry that plan into effect by force of arms was a rebel. The southern Whig believed in the sovereignty of the States as absolutely as he did in a protective tariff, and he thought more about the title to his property than either. The abolitionist was at once to him a crank and a thief—the biggest sort of a crank and the meanest sort of a thief. He was more interested in saving his "nigger" than in lowering the price of his shirt.

It was not long, under the stress of war and the suffering, outrage, and humiliation of reconstruction, until the southern Whig—for the time being, at least—abandoned his old protection proclivities, because the same doctrine had been preached for ten years by "an infernal abolitionist and a Yark." The northern Democrat ceased to talk about free trade, because free

trade had become a hobby with the southern Whig, who was, in his eye, a slaveholding brute before the war and a rebel and a traitor after it.

For thirty years men north and south were unable to look at a business proposition as colorless as a pane of plate glass and as passionless as the multiplication table, because they could not see it distinctly through the red haze of war, and they could not discuss it without recalling the bitter and bloody memories of Bull Run and Appomattox, or the still sadder story of eleven States outraged, pillaged, and dishonored in their destitution and helplessness.

The old Democrat in the Northwest, who had been a Democrat from principle, was now an inveterate Republican from passion, and the old Whig in the South, who had been a Whig from conviction, became a Democrat, not because of any change in his ideas about the tariff, but from long years of suffering and sympathy with those who did not agree with him on the tariff.

TARIFF THE BEST ASSET OF A RATIONAL AND NATIONAL DEMOCRACY.

And so it went through the troubled or turbulent administrations of Grant, Hayes, Garfield and Arthur, Harrison, and Cleveland, and last but not least, the strenuous Theodore. The bitter memories of the war were softened by time, though not obliterated. The wounds no longer bled, but the cicatrix was an unpleasant reminder, and each fellow remembered the maker of his scars. The first really honest talk about a new Nation and a new South was in the South; but no matter how forgiving the vanquished might be, there could be no genuine or permanent reconciliation until the victor himself ceased to discuss and no longer remembered the civil war, and the victor, be it remembered, was the Grand Army of the Republic, and the Grand Army of the Republic is the biggest asset the Republican party possesses, with the possible exception of the negro.

William Howard Taft is the first Republican President—he is the first real big Republican in or out of office—who has honestly and earnestly attempted a genuine reconciliation between the sections, a reconciliation based not upon mutual forgiveness, but upon absolute oblivion so far as the issues arising from the civil war are concerned. He has gone to the right place to preach his doctrine—the South, to the city of Atlanta, the very spot where the backbone and the heart of the confederacy were broken; where the Army of the Tennessee, through the fatuity of Hood, was crushed, then scattered like chaff by the winds, literally obliterated, not enough left of the "orphan brigade" to bury its dead; the spot from which Sherman started on his fateful march to the sea. And when all the rest of the South shall blossom like the rose, here and there in the wake of that swath of havoc and fire the historian will still discover a live coal hot and angry, "like a blood-red carbuncle upon the ashen breast of barbarism." When the memories of the civil war no longer embitter the hearts and fire the minds of southerners, in the city of Atlanta, the work is done. Taft has done that work. He has literally and forever buried the "bloody shirt," and he has buried it in Atlanta, paradoxical as it may seem, buried it amid the unmarked graves of countless southern slain.

Now, there is one thing that never occurred to Mr. Taft. He can not bury the "bloody shirt" in Atlanta and nail it to his flagstaff in Duluth or Des Moines. That is one peculiar thing about the "bloody shirt." If you bury a part of it, you have not buried any of it. You can not save any souvenirs from that detested garment. For the first time in two generations, western planters are beginning to study the tariff simply as a matter of business.

The so-called "insurrection" in the House—the Cummins idea, the western cry for tariff reduction—is not a new thing. It is not a fad or tidal wave. It is the inevitable result of the burying of that same shirt. The insurgents are but the evidence of a condition which they did not produce, which, in fact, produced them in spite of themselves. These so-called "insurgents" are enthusiastically supported by their constituency. They are politicians, like other Congressmen. No politician would deliberately make war upon the czar of the House of Representatives—the "Iron Duke" from Illinois—just for the fun of the thing, or from personal spite or resentment. They were literally hurled at JOE CANNON by the force of public opinion, as from a catapult.

We have said that the old Whig map of the United States was submerged in a troubled sea of blood. In the Tropics, especially in the volcanic regions, it is not unusual for a whole archipelago to sink beneath the surface almost in a night, submerged by some gigantic seismic convulsion. When the unknown force ceases to act, and the subterranean lava is cooled and the imprisoned gases have escaped from the flaming throat of some volcano, normal nature reasserts herself.

The force of gravity slowly and silently lifts the same islands once more to the surface of the sea. Superficial scientists look for a cataclysm and regard the reappearance of these new islands as the evidence of some subterranean convulsion. By and by the geologist digs beneath the drying ooze of the sea and finds evidence of human habitation. Those islands were the Pompeii and the Herculaneum of the deep. It is probable the ancient mariner caught glimpses of their fronded palms, and Phœnician sailors once, perchance, rested beneath their grateful shade.

Tariff revision now and free trade to-morrow in Iowa, Minnesota and Kansas is not a tidal wave. It is a rock against which tidal waves shall break in vain. It is the reappearance of the old Whig map, for forty years submerged in a boiling sea of gore. They mark the sky line of the political sea just as it greeted the eye of "Hickory" Jackson and Henry Clay. The Cummins idea is not a discovery; it is an evolution. CUMMINS got that idea from his great-grandfather, and he does not know it, and he proclaims it for the same reason that his grandfather did—because protection is robbery to the producer in a free-trade market, and the Iowans, like all other agriculturists in this country, are producers in a free-trade market.

Tariff revision, old-fashioned, bottom-rock, common-sense, straight-from-the-shoulder Jeffersonian Democracy, maintained and proclaimed like Paul preached the Christian religion—Christ only and Him crucified—will sweep the West like a holocaust, like a prairie fire, and it will sweep it because the people in the West, no longer blinded by the passion of war, once more see clearly their own interests, and their own interests are radical, effective, immediate tariff revision, not tariff tinkering, but tariff abolition to the point of tariff for revenue only.

It may be suggested that where one door opens another shuts, what we gain in the West we will lose in the South, and that by making the tariff and the tariff only the paramount and sole issue Florida with her pineapples and sea-island cotton, and Alabama with her iron, and Louisiana with her sugar, and southern Texas with her hides will be lost to Democracy for the same reason and by virtue of the same conditions.

Nay, verily, Louisiana, sugar or no sugar, rice or no rice; Florida, with her sea-island cotton; Alabama, with her iron ore, shall stay right where they are—in the solid South, Democratic from necessity if not from conviction.

It is not the memory of a past war, but the existence of an ubiquitous and ever-present "nigger" that will keep those States in line. "Nolens volens," no matter how anxious her Representatives may be to serve a few special interests, the South does not dare to sacrifice her civilization to her selfishness. Over 50 per cent of its population is black. Unrestricted suffrage means that the black man will vote and vote for a black man, and that spells negro domination, and negro domination spells havoc with the property of men and the honor and safety of women in the South. There are perchance to-day several prominent southern statesmen sitting solitary and somewhat uncomfortable in the Democratic band wagon, casting a longing eye to another vehicle loaded with luscious pie called a "Republican band wagon." But they can not climb down out of the Democratic band wagon and cross the road to take their places in the other concern; they are afraid a "nigger" will catch them on the way. That is the situation in a nutshell.

Consider for an instant a Republican Mississippi; 59 per cent of her population is black. Suppose the white men in Mississippi become Republicans, vote for Republican Congressmen, and a Republican governor. Mr. Negro comes along and asks the privilege of doing the same thing. They tell him he is a thick-skulled and kinky-headed fool and has not sense enough to vote. A cornfield dandy would have the sense to reply that it looked a little hard that it took his intelligent white master forty years to learn how to vote like a "fool nigger" who had been pining for the privilege of casting his ballot for that same Republican candidate for forty years. Strange kind of intelligence it would be, that was forty years behind the brutal intuitions and animal instincts of a "Guinea nigger," and yet the "Guinea nigger" and his white master would, after all, have reached a common conclusion, guided by a common impulse—greed for gain. Bourke Cockran has well said that "Democracy is a faith, Republicanism an appetite." And the white gentleman from Louisiana or Florida has no advantage over the African from Dahomey when it comes to appetite.

Suppose, on the other hand, the white Republican should refuse to allow his black Republican brother to vote for the same candidate he supports, not because he was politically wrong, but just simply because he was a negro. The proud scions of the Saxon race, the once aristocratic and patrician

Democracy of the Southern States, would find themselves excluded from every national Republican convention at the command of the black barbers and waiters from Indianapolis and Cincinnati. The negro is the balance of power in Ohio, Indiana, Illinois, and West Virginia, and he is the only hope of Republicanism in Missouri, Kentucky, Tennessee, and Maryland; and the negro would rise in revolt; the Brownsville affair would be only an episode. A Republican Mississippi is a moral and political impossibility on any issue, so long as the fatuitous absolute domination of the negro is at last the source and secret of Republican power in the United States. We have all to gain and nothing to lose by the burial of the "bloody shirt" and the forcing of the tariff to the forefront, and William Howard Taft is unwittingly lending us aid and comfort at both ends of the line.

ANNEXATION OF CUBA.

Mr. HELM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to send the following resolution to the desk, and to have it read by the Clerk.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman ask unanimous consent for consideration of the resolution?

Mr. HELM. No, sir; I ask to have it read at the Clerk's desk. I offer the resolution and ask to have it read.

Mr. PAYNE. I should like to know what it is.

Mr. HELM. It is a resolution relative to the annexation of Cuba, which I propose to introduce.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Kentucky asks unanimous consent to have the resolution read at the Clerk's desk. Is there objection?

Mr. PAYNE. I think it is safe to object.

Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, under the order heretofore agreed to, the House (at 12 o'clock and 5 minutes p. m.) adjourned until Thursday, April 22, 1909.

PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials of the following titles were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. TAWNEY: A bill (H. R. 8098) making appropriations for the expenses of the Thirteenth Decennial Census for the fiscal year 1910, and for other purposes—to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. KINKAID of Nebraska: A bill (H. R. 8099) to amend an act entitled "An act appropriating the receipts from the sale and disposal of public lands in certain States and Territories to the construction of irrigation works for the reclamation of arid lands"—to the Committee on Irrigation of Arid Lands.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8100) authorizing reinstatement of commutation certificate for homestead entries when canceled for lack of residence if entryman had resided continuously on entry the eight months preceding the making of proof—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. MORGAN of Oklahoma: A bill (H. R. 8101) for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building in the city of Woodward, Okla.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8102) to provide for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building thereon at El Reno, Okla.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8103) to provide for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building at Anadarko, Okla.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8104) to provide for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building thereon at Alva, Okla.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. MACON: A bill (H. R. 8105) appropriating the receipts from the sale and disposal of public lands in certain States to the construction of works for the drainage or reclamation of swamp and overflowed lands belonging to the United States, and for other purposes—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8106) to prohibit the receipt, delivery, or transmission of interstate or foreign messages, or other information to be used in connection with, and to prohibit interstate and foreign transactions of every character and description that in any wise depend upon margins as a part thereof, and for other purposes—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HUGHES of West Virginia: A bill (H. R. 8107) to provide rebate of the duty on wheat—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ALEXANDER of Missouri: A bill (H. R. 8108) to provide for the purchase of a site and the erection of a building thereon at the city of Liberty, in the State of Missouri—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8109) to provide for the purchase of a site and the erection of a building thereon at the city of Cameron, in the State of Missouri—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8110) to provide for the purchase of a site and the erection of a building thereon at the city of Excelsior Springs, in the State of Missouri—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. WASHBURN: A bill (H. R. 8111) to aid in the erection of a monument to Pocahontas at Jamestown, Va.—to the Committee on the Library.

By Mr. SIMS: A bill (H. R. 8112) to erect a post-office building in the city of Huntingdon, State of Tennessee—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. CARTER: A bill (H. R. 8113) authorizing the donation of the United States jail at McAlester, Okla., to Pittsburg County, Okla.—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HUBBARD of West Virginia: A bill (H. R. 8114) providing for an additional judge in the fourth judicial circuit—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RUCKER of Missouri: A bill (H. R. 8115) providing for the erection of a public building at Brookfield, Mo.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8116) providing for the erection of a public building at Trenton, Mo.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8117) to extend the provisions of the pension act of June 27, 1890, to the Enrolled Missouri Militia and other militia organizations of the State of Missouri that co-operated with the military or naval forces of the United States in suppressing the war of the rebellion—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8118) providing for the erection of a public building at Chillicothe, Mo.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. HOUSTON: A bill (H. R. 8119) to prohibit the issuance of federal license to sell liquors in States or counties where the local laws forbid the sale of intoxicating liquors—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HELM: Concurrent resolution (H. C. Res. 15) regarding the possible annexation of Cuba—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. CLARK of Missouri: Resolution (H. Res. 60) of inquiry touching sale of Tennessee Coal and Iron Company—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FOSTER of Vermont: Resolution (H. Res. 61) to suspend payment of salaries to clerks, assistant clerks, and janitors to certain committees of the House of Representatives—to the Committee on Accounts.

By Mr. ANDREWS: Memorial of the legislature of the Territory of New Mexico, urging an appropriation of money or land scrip for the purpose of relieving the counties of Santa Fe and Grant from public indebtedness—to the Committee on the Territories.

By Mr. WASHBURN: Memorial of the legislature of Massachusetts, protesting against the imposition by the Federal Government of a tax on inheritances—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ALEXANDER of Missouri: A bill (H. R. 8120) granting a pension to Elizabeth Morrison and her heirs—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ALEXANDER of New York: A bill (H. R. 8121) granting an increase of pension to Charles Baker Strout—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ALLEN: A bill (H. R. 8122) for the relief of St. John Lumber Company, of Portland, Me.—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. AUSTIN: A bill (H. R. 8123) granting an increase of pension to Bruce Clifton—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8124) granting an increase of pension to Samuel B. Montgomery—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions. Also, a bill (H. R. 8125) for the relief of Henry Jones—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BENNETT of Kentucky: A bill (H. R. 8126) granting an increase of pension to Charles L. Crane—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. BOEHNE: A bill (H. R. 8127) granting an increase of pension to Henry M. Lamb—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8128) granting an increase of pension to M. M. Angleton—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8129) granting an increase of pension to William M. Myers—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BYRNS: A bill (H. R. 8130) granting a pension to Andrew M. Watson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8131) for the relief of Tusculum Church—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8132) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of Ed. Pruett and grant him a pension—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8133) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of George A. Easterley and grant him a pension—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8134) for the relief of the legal representative of the estate of A. L. P. Green—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8135) for the relief of the trustees of the Cumberland Presbyterian Church of Clarksville, Tenn.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8136) granting arrears of pension to William H. Willett—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CANNON: A bill (H. R. 8137) granting a bounty to Ira Bacon—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8138) granting an increase of pension to Parmenas Roush—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CHAPMAN: A bill (H. R. 8139) granting a pension to Hannah M. Batt—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. COLE: A bill (H. R. 8140) to correct the military record of Tyler Thompson—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8141) for the relief of Willis Mahon—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8142) granting an increase of pension to Price Castle—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CULLOP: A bill (H. R. 8143) granting an increase of pension to Allen Connor—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8144) granting an increase of pension to John McMillin—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8145) granting a pension to Phillip H. Smith—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GRAFF: A bill (H. R. 8146) granting an increase of pension to Alrena Warner—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8147) granting an increase of pension to Edward G. Rockhold—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8148) granting an extension of Letters Patent No. 473019 to William J. Plecker—to the Committee on Patents.

By Mr. GRANT: A bill (H. R. 8149) to correct the military record of Levi Jones—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. GRIEST: A bill (H. R. 8150) to remove the charge of desertion standing against the military record of Henry Dimler—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HIGGINS: A bill (H. R. 8151) granting an increase of pension to James M. Strickland—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HAMILTON: A bill (H. R. 8152) granting an increase of pension to Almon Woodworth—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LANGHAM: A bill (H. R. 8153) granting an increase of pension to George L. Van Horn—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8154) granting an increase of pension to Oliver H. Scott—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8155) granting an increase of pension to John W. Miller—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8156) granting an increase of pension to Franklin Klingensmith, alias Franklin Clingsmith—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. McHENRY: A bill (H. R. 8157) granting an increase of pension to Joseph L. Frame—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8158) granting an increase of pension to Oliver P. Barr—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8159) granting a pension to Martin Purcell—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. McKINNEY: A bill (H. R. 8160) granting an increase of pension to John Vandiver—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MARTIN of Colorado: A bill (H. R. 8161) removing the charge of desertion from the name of George A. McKenzie, alias William A. Williams—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. MORGAN of Oklahoma: A bill (H. R. 8162) granting an increase of pension to Joel Benham—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8163) granting an increase of pension to Welcome N. Bender—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8164) granting a pension to Frank Delaney—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8165) granting a pension to Margaret D. Brewer—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8166) to remove charge of desertion against Jacob Mull—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. MURPHY: A bill (H. R. 8167) granting an increase of pension to Sidney Rinck—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8168) granting an increase of pension to Henry Roam—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8169) granting an increase of pension to Charles M. Skinner—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8170) granting an increase of pension to Oliver W. Shockley—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8171) granting an increase of pension to Jabez Goodman—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8172) granting an increase of pension to Robert A. Harper—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8173) granting an increase of pension to James Kinsley—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8174) granting an increase of pension to Francis M. Kittrell—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8175) granting an increase of pension to T. M. Laughlin—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8176) granting an increase of pension to Joseph A. Nimmo—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8177) granting an increase of pension to John A. Pond—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8178) granting an increase of pension to William H. Burgess—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8179) granting a pension to James R. Shelton—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8180) granting a pension to Hannah Murphy—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8181) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of Erhard Woener—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8182) for the relief of J. M. Rodgers—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8183) to correct the military record of V. B. Gatewood—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8184) to amend and correct the records of Company I, Fourth Regiment Missouri Volunteer Infantry, by including the name of William J. Elmer therein, with the dates of his enlistment and discharge—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8185) to amend and correct the records of Company D, Seventh Regiment Provisional Enrolled Missouri Militia, by including the name of Valentine Fraker therein, with the dates of his enlistment and discharge—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. RUCKER of Missouri: A bill (H. R. 8186) granting an increase of pension to Charity Breeding—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8187) granting an increase of pension to Logan A. Tallman—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8188) granting an increase of pension to Simeon McKinstry—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8189) granting an increase of pension to James Murphy—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8190) granting an increase of pension to Fannie Hicks—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8191) granting an increase of pension to William T. Snow—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8192) granting an increase of pension to Samuel C. Davis—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8193) granting an increase of pension to Jasper N. Cummins—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8194) granting an increase of pension to William H. Bradley—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8195) granting an increase of pension to Elijah G. Ballard—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8196) granting an increase of pension to Cornelius Buckley—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8197) granting an increase of pension to George W. Sorrell—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8198) granting an increase of pension to John R. Pickens—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8199) granting an increase of pension to Hannah J. Farr—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8200) granting an increase of pension to Cassius M. Myers—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8201) granting an increase of pension to William Smith—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8202) granting an increase of pension to Frederick W. Odell—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8203) granting an increase of pension to John C. Schnelle—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8204) granting an increase of pension to William H. Cummings—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8205) granting an increase of pension to Josiah Stoneburner—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8206) granting an increase of pension to Joseph G. Banning—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8207) granting an increase of pension to George W. Brookover, jr.—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8208) granting an increase of pension to John C. Chapman—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8209) granting an increase of pension to John T. Burriss—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8210) granting an increase of pension to Joseph W. James—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8211) granting a pension to Thomas Lamb—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8212) granting a pension to John Carroll—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8213) granting a pension to Mary P. Crampton—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8214) granting a pension to Martha Eyler—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8215) granting a pension to Jackson Lambert—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8216) granting a pension to Archibald Spencer—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8217) granting a pension to Taylor Jones—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8218) granting a pension to Nancy B. Ruberson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8219) granting a pension to Robert T. McElhiney—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8220) granting a pension to Myra E. Chapman—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8221) for the relief of McCarty & Collins—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8222) granting relief to Charles Abolt and others—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8223) to correct the military record of John Loney—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8224) to correct the military record of John P. Griffith—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8225) to remove the charge of desertion against Lewis Jenkins—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8226) to remove the charge of desertion against Charles W. Miller, alias Charles Nowack—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. STURGISS: A bill (H. R. 8227) granting an increase of pension to Nelson B. Miller—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. THOMAS of Kentucky: A bill (H. R. 8228) granting an increase of pension to Thomas A. Nally—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

By Mr. ALEXANDER of New York: Petition of Buffalo Photo Engravers' Union, Local No. 4, favoring duty on post cards—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BURLEIGH: Petition of Dirigo Local, No. 84, Brotherhood of Paper Makers, of Augusta, Me., against reduction of the tariff on print paper—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MICHAEL E. DRISCOLL: Petition of citizens of Syracuse, Euclid, Hamilton, and Clay, N. Y., favoring reduction of duty on raw and refined sugars—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Central City Electrotyping and Engraving Company, favoring duty on post cards—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GRIEST: Petition of Lancaster (Pa.) Board of Trade, against legislation tending to reduce the lawful earnings of railroad corporations and to aggravate popular hostility against them—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. KAHN: Petition of Alfred F. Boad and 17 other citizens of San Francisco, favoring duty on post cards—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Asiatic Exclusion League, favoring enactment of an effective exclusion law against all Asiatics other than merchants, students, and travelers—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. MURPHY: Petitions of Farmers' Unions, No. 761, of Simmons; No. 786, of Embree; No. 754, of Wright County; No. 763, of Hartshorn; and No. 807, of Mahan, all of the State of Missouri, favoring a parcels-post system—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. NEEDHAM: Petition of Chamber of Commerce of Los Angeles, against reduction of tariff on products of California agriculture and horticulture and against repeal of countervailing duty on petroleum—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petitions of Chamber of Commerce of Wilmington and Chamber of Commerce of San Diego County, Cal., favoring a government freight and passenger line of steamships for principal ports on Pacific coast and Panama—to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Also, petitions of D. Olliver Brothers, Carriage and Wagon Builders' Association, and others, of San Francisco, for repeal of tariff on hides—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of lithographic employees, against reduction of tariff on lithographic products—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Merchants' Exchange of Oakland, Cal., against reduction of duty on wool—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of grain producers of Pacific coast, against a duty on grain bags—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of J. M. Hicks and others, against a duty on tea and coffee—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Mrs. H. Cartledge, against increase of duty on gloves and hosiery—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Woodland Local, No. 146, International Brotherhood of Paper Makers, against reduction of duty on print paper—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of hop growers of California, favoring an increase of duty on hops—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Asiatic Exclusion League, for enactment of an effective Asiatic-exclusion law save against merchants, students, and travelers—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petition of board of trustees of Stockton Chamber of Commerce, favoring rebuilding of jetties at the entrance of Humboldt Bay, California—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, petition of Marine Engineers' Beneficial Association No. 35, approving work and policies of the National River and Harbor Congress—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, petition of mayor of the city of San Francisco and members of the senate and house of representatives of California, against appropriating the encroachment on the Hetch Hetchy Valley for water-storing privileges—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, petition of business men of Gonzales, Salida, Reedley, and Salinas, Cal., against a parcels-post law—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

Also, petition of Chamber of Commerce of San Francisco, favoring immediate occupation of the new immigrant station on Angel Island—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. PRINCE: Petition of L. M. Lawler and others, of Galesburg, Ill., against increase of duty on hosiery—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ROBINSON: Paper to accompany bill for relief of G. A. Joyner (H. R. 1173)—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. THOMAS of Ohio: Petition of citizens of the Nineteenth Congressional District of Ohio, against a duty on tea and coffee—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WASHBURN: Petition of sundry citizens of Worcester, Mass., favoring reduction of duty on raw and refined sugars—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

SENATE.

TUESDAY, April 20, 1909.

Prayer by Rev. Ulysses G. B. Pierce, of the city of Washington.

The Journal of yesterday's proceedings was read and approved.

MAJ. PIERRE CHARLES L'ENFANT.

The VICE-PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following communication from the president of the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia, which was read, and, on motion of Mr. GALLINGER, referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia:

EXECUTIVE OFFICE,
COMMISSIONERS OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA,
Washington, April 17, 1909.

To the Senate of the United States:

The Commissioners of the District of Columbia have the honor to invite the Members of the Senate of the United States to attend the ceremonies in honor of Maj. Pierre Charles L'Enfant in the Rotunda of the United States Capitol at 10.30 o'clock on the morning of April 28, 1909, in connection with the transfer of his remains from Green Hill, Maryland, to the Arlington Cemetery. The Vice-President of the United States and the ambassador of France will make addresses.

Very respectfully,

HENRY B. F. MACFARLAND,
President Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

Mr. HALE. I present a very important petition, and I ask that, without the names, it may be printed in the Record with the accompanying statement, and that it lie on the table.

There being no objection, the petition and accompanying statement, omitting the names, were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed in the Record, as follows:

To the Committee on Finance:

The undersigned, engaged in the manufacture or sale of woolen goods, recognizing the unfairness to a large portion of the woolen industry in the method of collecting the duty on wool on a specific basis, request that in the revised tariff bill the duty on wool be collected on an ad valorem basis, unless, however, a specific duty can be made on a basis more just and equal according to the value of the different grades of wool; also that we are not in favor of reducing the duty on wools as a general proposition.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Wool clothing is essential to the existence of civilized man in temperate and cold climates. The better he is provided with wool clothing, the better able is he to ward off disease and death. We appear here in behalf of the most important of the two great branches of wool manufacturing, that known as the carded woolen industry. It is the most important in respect to the number of operatives employed, wages paid, and the capacity to provide the people with durable and warm clothing at a low price. The Dingley tariff law places the carded woolen industry at a serious disadvantage in performing this essential service for the people, and at the same time that law confers important special favors upon the other branch of wool manufacturing, known as the "worsted industry." This discrimination against the one and the favors conferred on the other will be made clear by a brief outline of the technical conditions.

Worsted is made by combing, which separates the long fibers from the shorter, and then converting these long fibers into yarn and cloth. On the other hand, carded woolen goods are made by carding the wool without separation of the short fibers from the long and then converting the carded wool into yarn and cloth. In the nature of things, the longer stapled wool is used for worsteds, the shorter wools for carded woolen goods. As a result of these conditions worsted is, as a rule, more expensive than carded woolens. Worsted is adapted more particularly for high-priced clothing, carded woolens for the less expensive clothing. Now, the wools suited for carded woolen goods carry a large amount of grease and dirt as they come from the sheep's back, a much larger amount of grease and dirt than the worsted wools ordinarily carry. It is by no means unusual to find the wool suited for carded woolen goods with four pounds of grease and dirt to every pound of wool, and wool suited for worsted with no more than 1 pound of grease and dirt to every 4 pounds of wool. Hardly two lots of wool can be found that shrink the same by scouring, but the bulk of the shorter wools suited for carded woolen goods is heavy shrinking, while the bulk of the worsted goods is light shrinking.

The Dingley duty on grease wools of classes 1 and 2, which is the same in the Payne bill, is specific, 11 and 12 cents a pound, respectively. It is plain that this specific duty on grease wools is, in fact, much higher on the scoured weight of heavy-shrinking wool than on the scoured weight of light-shrinking wool. Applying the 11-cent duty to the two cases just cited, this duty would be equal to 55 cents a scoured pound for the heavy-shrinking wool and only 13½ cents a scoured pound for the light-shrinking wool. The price of heavy-shrinking wool per scoured pound for carded woolen goods is usually less than that of worsted wools. These two factors in the problem, the greater quantity of grease and dirt on which the specific duty must be paid, and the lower price of wool for carded woolen goods result in extremely wide variations in the ad valorem equivalents of the Dingley wool duties. An application of the Dingley duty to 60,000,000 pounds of wool sold at London two months ago showed that the ad valorem equivalent of that duty was as low as 23 per cent on light-shrinking and high-priced lots of unwashed wool, and as high as 550 per cent on heavy-shrinking and low-priced lots. The result is that the importations of wool into the United States are confined to the light-shrinking higher priced grades suited for worsted, while the heavy-shrinking and lower priced wools suited for carded woolen goods are excluded from the United States as effectually as if the law made it a capital crime to import them.

This condition is well illustrated by the fact that the average ad valorem equivalent of the Dingley duty on 80,000,000 pounds of wool recently offered for sale in the leading foreign markets was 94 per cent, while the ad valorem equivalent of the Dingley duty on the wool actually imported into the United States last year (1908) was only 44 per cent, because of its light shrinkage.